Vol. IX., No. 10. JANUARY, 1920.

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A Magazine to maintain the cause of
TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS
in the Church of England.

EDITOR: REV. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Signs of the Times :—	
A New Year's Message	451
The Outlook	452
Thirty Years' Progress in Biblical Studies	453
The Voice of the Younger Generation	455
The Spirit of the Church of England	457
The Advance of Modernism	459
A Voice from the Navy	460
Wake up! Laymen	462
Modernism and the Creeds Rev. R. F. Cardale, M.A.	465
Industrial Problems and their Christian Solution Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Carlisle.	472
Problems of Clerical Poverty	477
'Private Vices' and 'Public Benefits' Very Rev. W. R. Inge, D.D., C.V.O.	482
Fellowship, Recognition and Unity	487
Reviews:—	
Broad Church Theology	493
A Cheerful Mystic	495
Churchmen's Union News	500
Correspondence	500

OXFORD: B. H. BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET.
London Agents: Simpkin, Marshall & Co.

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 7/6.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

All literary contributions and books for review should be addressed to:—The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Ripon Hall, Oxford.

All advertisements and orders should be addressed to:—Mr. B. H. BLACKWELL, Office of *The Modern Churchman*, 49 Broad Street, Oxford.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President: Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq.
The Ven. Archdeacon CHARLES, F B.A.
G. COURTAULD, Esq.
The Rev. Canon CREMER.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE, F.B.A.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY.
The Rev. Professor HENSLOW.
Sir LAURENCE JONES, Bt.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE.
The Rev. W. MANNING, M.A.
The Rev. Dr. MORRISON, LL.D.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON, M.A.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon PLUMPTRE.
LORD RUSSELL OF LIVERPOOL.
J. ST LOE STRACHEY, Esq.
The Rev. Dr. SYMONDS.

Members of the Council:

Chairman: Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Mr. F. H. ANSON, Prof. Sir W. ASHLEY, Ph.D., Preb. A. CALDECOTT, D.Litt., Canon CREMER, M.A., Rev. W. MANNING, M.A., Hon. Mrs. MATHESON, Rev. G. RENDALL, D.Litt., Mr. NOWELL SMITH, M.A., Rev. A A. SYMONDS, D.D., D.Litt., Hon. G. COLERIDGE, Rev. A. FAWKES, M.A., Rev. JOHN GAMBLE, B D., Rev. W. LUMMIS, B.D., REV. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., C. NORWOOD, D.Litt., Canon PAPILLON, M.A., Mrs. REITH, Mr. H. F. WALKER, Miss ALLEN, Right Rev. Bishop BAYNES, Mr. W. B. GORDON, M.A., Rev. H. HANDLEY, M.A., The Very Rev. W. R. INGE, C.V.O., D.D., Professor F. B. JEVONS, D.Litt., Rev. C. H. S. MATTHEWS, M.A., Sir HARRY REICHEL, LL.D., Rev. C. F. RUSSELL, M.A., The DEAN OF CARLISLE, Canon TOLLINTON, D.D., Rev. H. A. WILSON, M.A., Rev. C. SHARP, M.A., Rev. Dr. MORRISON, Rev. C. EMMET, B.D., Miss A. GARDNER.

Hon. Secretary and Acting Treasurer—PHILIP BAGENAL, O.B.E., 32 George Street, Hanover Square, W.1.
Hon. Auditor.—Mr. ROBERT WARNER, F.C.A., 221 Moorgate Station Chambers, E.C.2.
Hon. Organizing Secretary.—Miss D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Bankers.—LONDON CITY AND MIDLAND BANK, 129 New Bond Street, W.1.

AIMS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.
2.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.
3.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the adaptation of the Church services to the needs and knowledge of the time.
6.—To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.
7.—To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.
8.—To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

Annual Subscription.—Members at least 7/6; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10. Cheques should be made payable to the Hon. Secretary of the Churchmen's Union.

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to the Hon. Secretary, Churchmen's Union, 32 George Street, Hanover Square, W.1.

The Modern Churchman is sent free to all full members of the Churchmen's Union.

FOR CONTENTS AND OPINIONS SEE FOLLOWING PAGES.

162 *pages Crown 8vo, tastefully bound in Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.*
Post free, 5s. net.

"ALL TOO HUMAN?"

AN ESSAY IN CHRISTIAN APOLOGETIC

BY

Rev. SAMUEL PROUDFOOT
Editor of "The Optimist."
Vicar of North Somercotes.

Sometimes it is said that Christianity is a human—an intensely human—religion. But it is for this very reason that he regards it as a perfect religion for humanity.

For he believes that the "divineness" of Christianity is to be looked for in its being perfectly human; just as the "divineness" of Christ for us is to be looked for in His being perfect Man.

Thus Christianity is human, but it is not "all too human." If it were less human it would fall short of being divine.

LONDON
A. BROWN & SONS, LTD., 5 FARRINGDON AVENUE, E.C. 4
AND THROUGH ALL BOOKSELLERS

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION	xi
I.	THE DOCTRINE OF THE INCARNATION	1
II.	THE CHURCH AND HUMANITY	19
III.	THE SACRAMENTS	33
IV.	SIN AND HUMANITY	52
V.	THE LAW OF PRAYER	70
VI.	ETERNAL LIFE	90
VII.	THE CHURCH'S JUSTIFICATION	109
VIII.	THE UNION OF THE CHURCHES	130
	INDEX	161

TWO APPRECIATIONS

THE BISHOP OF HEREFORD writes :—"I have read through 'All Too Human?' with much pleasure and agreement. It is, I think, calculated to do much good."

Mr. T. H. MAWSON, of Lancaster, writes :—"I have read 'All Too Human?' with the greatest interest and profit, and congratulate you on a book of such excellence. I felt that you would do something good when writing on the subject of Unity of the Churches, but you have surpassed my greatest expectations, and I think the book as a whole is deserving of a wide circulation, especially amongst the Free Churches."

A FEW PRESS OPINIONS

The Manchester Guardian :—" A deeply interesting and original work. The Author is well known as Editor of ' The Optimist.' "

The Enquirer says :—" This is a searching enquiry into the causes of the failure of organised Christianity to touch the great mass of the people in a Christian country. It is a protest against the deistic idea which the Churches still harbour and a passionate plea for the humanising of the idea of God so that men may live with Him and in Him as consciously realising His indwelling.

' The whole duty of man,' says Mr. Proudfoot, ' as set forth by Jesus is love to man.' It is in service that their salvation and his is to be found, and he ' would like to see all the Churches praying for the True Spirit and the Light, and all Christians joining together in every possible way in making wiser and juster laws, in fighting against every sphere of vice, in joining together in prayer and praise and in social intercourse.'

And the Author practices what he preaches. His seven years' incumbency at North Somercotes has been a drawing together of the sects and a united activity in social, ameliorative and religious work that were unknown and scarcely imagined until this Liberal Catholic showed in spirit and in action what true Catholicism is. The book is one to make one think."

The Church Family Newspaper says :—" It is an original work and one which will help very considerably in the new reconstruction of the Church in this new age."

The Christian Church says :—" There is a breezy heartiness here that should surely attract the thoughtful man in the street. It may give them a new sturdy, and robust faith and faithfulness."

The Expository Times says :—" The volume contains a frank criticism of prevalent teaching, without respect of person or church. But there is neither conceit nor contempt in the criticism. If organised Christianity has failed, Mr. Proudfoot feels that he has contributed to the failure. There are, however, great facts that stand sure, the Incarnation, the Sacraments, the forgiveness of Sin, the power of Prayer, and the offer of Eternal Life. Let these facts find way with us and all will yet be well. The last chapter, which could have come first, is on the reunion of the Churches. If all were as this English vicar reunion would be very near."

[P.T.O.

The Times Literary Supplement says :—" The book deserves attention . . . . the Author shows independence, and he is not afraid to state his conclusions frankly."

The Louth Observer says :—" We heartily commend this arresting volume to the attention of all who are anxious to face bravely the problems which confront organised Christianity in this time of upheaval, when many of the old moorings and anchorages seem to be disappearing in the cataclysm which has overtaken the Western World."

The Lancaster Observer says :—" In this volume he is direct and clear, and his meaning is obvious even to those who do not claim to possess a trained theoretical or analytical mind, and he writes, as he says, ' not for the adept but for those whose minds and consciences are perplexed by the injustice, the unreason, the bitter and intolerable misery they see around them.' "

The Altrincham, Bowden and Hale Guardian says :—" The title indicates the scope and method of the book, which is a reply to those who wish to dismiss Christianity as a religion ' all too human ' in character to be (as it claims to be) a revelation from God. The Author, indeed, has no difficulty in showing that this kind of criticism appeals only to those who are obsessed by notions which have become antiquated. Modern religious thought is less concerned with revelations ' from outside,' and the ' supernatural ' is a phrase which may be said to have changed its meaning. It is now felt that religion proceeds ' from out of the heart of man ' and that the Divine is revealed internally. The Kingdom of God is within us."

The Lincolnshire Echo says :—" It is so full of high and noble thoughts that those who are seeking that out of the wreckage of war a nobler England shall arise, will find inspiration in the volume when they are downcast and depressed, optimism and light when the darkness of despondency and apparent failure falls upon them and with renewed energy and vigour will be urged to join in a grand crusade for ending poverty, oppression, vice, in elevating the child of every man to the height of his God-given faculties."

LONDON
A. BROWN & SONS, LTD., 5 FARRINGDON AVENUE, E.C. 4
AND THROUGH ALL BOOKSELLERS

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 10. JANUARY, 1920. Vol. IX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

A New Year's Message

The following message, just issued through the National Laymen's Missionary Movement, and signed by Mr. Lloyd-George, Sir Robert Borden, Mr. W. M. Hughes, Mr. W. J. Massey, General Louis Botha, and Mr. R. A. Squires, Prime Ministers respectively of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Newfoundland, is at least significant.

'To our fellow-citizens of the British Empire :—

The war, in shaking the very foundations of ordered civilization, has driven all thoughtful men to examine the bases of national and international life.

It has become clear to-day, both through the arbitrament of war and through the tests of rebuilding a life of peace, that neither education, science, diplomacy, nor commercial prosperity, when allied with a belief in material force as the ultimate power, are real foundations for the ordered development of the world's life. These things are in themselves simply the tools of the spirit that handles them.

Even the hope that lies before the world of a life of peace, protected and developed by a League of Nations, is itself dependent on something deeper and more fundamental still. The co-operation which the League of Nations explicitly exists to foster will become operative in so far as the consenting peoples have the spirit of good will. And the spirit of good will among men rests on spiritual forces, the hope of a "brotherhood of humanity," reposes on the deeper spiritual fact of the "Fatherhood of God."

In the recognition of the fact of that Fatherhood and of the Divine purpose for the world which are central to the message of

Christianity, we shall discover the ultimate foundation for the reconstruction of an ordered and harmonious life for all men. That recognition cannot be imposed by Government. It can only come as an act of free consent on the part of the individual men everywhere.

Responsible as we are in our separate spheres for a share in the guidance of the British Empire as it faces the problems of the future, we believe that in the acceptance of those spiritual principles lies the sure basis of world peace. We would therefore, commend to our fellow-citizens the necessity that men of good will, who are everywhere reviewing their personal responsibilities in relation to the reconstruction of civilization, should consider also the eternal validity and truth of those spiritual forces which are in fact the one hope for a permanent foundation for world peace.'

Sir Thomas More, although he could depict Utopia, wrote in one of his less imaginative moments :—

'It is not possible for all things to be well unless all men are good, which I think will not be yet these many years.'

The Outlook

The passing of the Enabling Bill through its last stages has produced a number of protests. Mrs. Humphry Ward wrote powerful letters to the *Manchester Guardian*; the Bishop of Hereford wrote to the *Times*; a protest also appeared in the *Times* from the Bishops of Carlisle, Manchester, Hereford and Newcastle, the Deans of St. Paul's, Peterborough and Carlisle, Canon Sanday, Lord Russell of Liverpool, Mrs. Humphry Ward and others. The main objection taken to the Bill was that the House of Commons had been prevented from considering the constitution of the future Church Assembly and the conditions of the Church franchise. Whilst we may doubt the utility of such protests, we sympathise with those who protested. We believe that they speak for a large number of laymen and clergymen who do not at all realise what the Enabling Bill really is or the uses to which it may be put: we are sure that not a few of those who have insisted on the negative declaration as a qualification for the Church franchise will themselves regret it later on; we recognise that the Bill is a menace to the Church's comprehensiveness and to other qualities more difficult to define and yet not less characteristic which have made the Church of England not so much the Church of the English nation as the Church of the English spirit and the English temperament; we apprehend the en-

couragement which the new conditions, created by the Bill, will give to the ecclesiastical politician and the ecclesiastical bureaucrat to propagate their pernicious spirit; but whilst we fear all these things, we feel equally strongly that none of these evils need befall the Church if large numbers of Churchmen who are at present pessimistic and somnolent will arouse themselves to take an intelligent interest and play a dutiful part in Church affairs. If they do, none of these evils will befall us, and the Church of England of the future may well transcend the glories of the Church of England of the past. If they refuse to arouse themselves, let them not bewail the loss of liberties and privileges which they lacked the energy and courage to retain.

Thirty Years Progress in Biblical Studies

The *Expository Times* published in its October and December issues two particularly interesting articles by Bishop Ryle and Professor James Moffatt respectively on the progress of Biblical studies during the last thirty years.

It is just thirty years since Bishop, then Professor, Herbert Ryle published his *Early Narratives of Genesis* as a series of articles. That book still forms the best practical introduction for the general reader to the Higher Criticism of Genesis, although times have changed greatly since then.

> 'Well! since those days we have travelled a great distance. The legitimate claims of scientific literary criticism have come into general recognition.'

Thus writes the Bishop as he notes the contributions made by Assyriology and Comparative Religion to the understanding of the history and development of the Religion of Israel. Dr. Ryle thinks that people nowadays could hardly credit the dearth of good English books on the Old Testament which prevailed when he was a young student reading for Theological Honours. Yet, he remarks, the main difficulty thirty years ago was not so much the lack of adequate literary assistance as the attitude of mind on the part of those who in the religious life of the country during the previous thirty years had been responsible for the guidance and direction of

thought upon the subject of the Old Testament. Fierce controversies had produced an inevitable reaction. Weariness, disgust, satiety, uncertainty and timidity ensued as a natural consequence. The appointment of young men such as Driver, Robertson Smith and Kirkpatrick to professorships marked, however, the beginning of a new era.

Unfortunately a strict doctrine of Verbal Inspiration in orthodox circles of thirty years ago created difficulties for the Biblical scholar, whose motives were often denounced as atheistic, and his results derided as merely destructive. Yet, as the Bishop affirms :—

> 'Thirty years have steadily confirmed the justice of the demand that the Bible should be subjected to the free application of the same methods of literary and historical study as other ancient writings. In the learned world a revolution has taken place: the so-called "critical position" has been universally accepted. . . The principles which some of us advocated thirty years ago, and on account of which we were denounced as "unsound" and our lectures labelled "dangerous," have now been generally adopted in the teaching of the Universities, both in Great Britain and America. The "New Learning" has triumphed.'

But the Bishop points out, and modern Churchmen may well take his words to heart, that the old views of the Bible still hold sway over large numbers of religious laymen. They neither read nor learn in this matter. The Bishop quotes a letter which runs as follows :—

> 'Amongst the masses of the population, it is almost universally accepted that you must believe in the historical and literary accuracy of these [Genesis] records or disbelieve the Bible altogether. *And the clergy universally acquiesce in this attitude of mind,* because, as they truly say, the subject is a difficult one, and it is easier to let it alone. But this policy of reticence is having a disastrous effect. It is indeed very largely responsible for the "alienation" from religion of which we hear, and see, so much.'

Professor Moffatt's article on New Testament Criticism is of no less interest in its department than Bishop Ryle's. The Professor refers to the 'persistent, minute, and varied study' to which the New Testament records have been subjected during the last thirty years, and remarks that

> 'The alteration in outlook has been great, greater perhaps than most of us at first realise. Each advance in New Testament criticism has been marked by successive controversies.'

—and he adds, and his words are worth noting—

> 'Controversy is a good thing in intellectual matters. It educates the public, and it clarifies the mind. It has acquired a bad name in religion and in theology, but controversy need not be quarrelling.'

We have not space here to enumerate these successive New Testament controversies, but we would direct our readers' attention to Dr. Moffatt's lucid and judicial summary of them.

Professor Moffatt holds that our respect for the New Testament is increased by vigorous and truthful investigation. It it seen to be no mere product of pathos and provincialism, but forms an excellent antidote to sentimentalism, although too often misused by the sentimentalists. The Professor's conclusion is thus stated :—

> 'The severe criticism to which the New Testament has been subjected during the past thirty years has made it impossible to regard this collection of books as a mosaic of texts to be fitted into proofs of dogmas. But it has also done away with the notion that the New Testament is the book of a timid, conventional little society which shrank from contact with the facts of life and sheltered itself behind pretty fancies about God and the world. It was not written for such persons, nor by such persons.'

The Voice of the Younger Generation

The Student Christian Movement, which is perhaps the most promising of all our younger Christian Movements today, has recently issued a message entitled 'A Call to Arms.' We give it in full, but without the signatures.

> The world is at a crisis when we believe Christians must attack or fail.
>
> Society has to be re-ordered.
>
> Through Christ men have the power to do it.
>
> The foundations of society are wrong, because the relations between man and man are wrong. We have failed to be Christians. Jesus told us to love one another, but as a plain matter of fact, we do not love one another. If we did, war would be at once condemned, and certain social conditions would not be tolerated.
>
> We are convinced that if men practise looking at society with the eyes of Jesus, they must make great changes in its structure. Would He tolerate the system under which our fellows live and work—a system which robs so many of their birthright of joy and freedom? We must study and think out these problems, and at any cost act on what we believe to be right.
>
> We are finding that obedience to Jesus Christ gives the power to live a life which is brimful of reality, purpose and hope. Nothing less can satisfy us now. We know that the spiritual power of Jesus

> Christ in us is greater than the power of evil, and therefore we believe that the Kingdom of God is coming in our world. We stand with Him and with all who serve Him down the centuries in the battle for His Kingdom.
>
> We have found in working with students of other nations and races a unity in Christ which overcomes prejudice and enriches the common life. Before God and in Christ we are all one. We are convinced that this unity is the only sure hope of peace and of the true development of nations. Now is the time to do all in our power to create a public opinion that shall constrain statesmen to act on this belief.
>
> We feel that the divisions of the Church in our country are no longer tolerable, because they obscure that unity in Christ which we know to be more real than our differences. We ask for instant and courageous action. We want to serve a Church which stands as one in fearless love of truth.
>
> The issue before us is a straight fight with the power of evil. Only in and through human lives can the power of God become effective. We are called to face sacrifice, apparent failure, and distress of body and soul, for the joy of the triumph of Jesus Christ in the lives of our fellow men and women.
>
> We ask you to search out the truth, and in obedience to it to take your side in the battle.

We regard this document, both in its spirit and its vagueness, as characteristic of the younger men and women of good will among our educated classes to-day. The majority of them believe in the principles of Jesus Christ; they are certain that the miseries and unrest of the modern world are due to those principles being ignored; they are convinced that the Christian Church must set the example of obeying those principles before the world's statesmen and leaders will attempt to base their policies upon them; there are two particular applications of those principles which the Church needs to exhibit at present before all others; these are the power of unity in Christ—a unity which rests on a deep faith in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man—and fearless devotion to truth —the outcome of the belief that God is Truth, and that the Spirit of Truth, in equal degree with the Spirit of Love, is the promised possession of the loyal disciples of Christ. The application of these principles is manifold and is supremely difficult; but the life of the Christian Church and its usefulness depend upon their application. The Student Christian Movement has done well to emphasize this in its manifesto. May we venture to suggest to the S.C.M., which is an eminently pacific body, to set a good example in a small matter and

abandon the use of military metaphors of which we are all rather weary. An American bishop has recently earned the gratitude of much-tried congregations by re-writing 'Onward, Christian soldiers,' which appears in the new version as:

'Onward, Christian workers,
Labouring for peace.'

The Spirit of the Church of England

There is nothing, we venture to think, less understood by a number of our English ecclesiastics than the spirit of the Church of which they are members. Possibly they do not understand it because they do not wish to understand it. 'Mayest thou never know the secret of what thou art,' expresses their unconscious wish, and also explains their feverish haste to transform their mother. In the December number of the *Anglo-French Review*, Lord Charnwood defines the essential character of the English Church. He does it with urbanity, and he does it with reverence, but what he writes would, if it were accepted, give the death-blow to ecclesiastical pretensions and ideals which are the very breath of life to many English clergymen and some few English laymen, who either think of the Church of England as a small but purified Catholic sect or as a large but heterogeneous Protestant communion. It is neither. Its spirit is not that of Rome or Geneva, but Westminster. It is a national Church. The Church of the English race in England. Lord Charnwood describes it as 'one of the most characteristic institutions of the English people.' We suppose the English Parliament and the English Monarchy are the two other English institutions worthy to rank with it. The English Parliament, although about as much abused today as the English Church, has become the Mother of Parliaments. The English Monarchy, although many have predicted its speedy abolition, is still the ideal of the constitutional ruler all the world over. Had her leaders better understood the genius of the English Church, she might have become by now the model Christian Church for the nations of mankind. So far none of her daughter churches, which without exception have departed from her pattern, have proved themselves to be

anything else but declining religious influences in the developing national communities in which they exist.

Lord Charnwood sees in the constitution and history of the Church of England something which he sees in no other great Christian communion, namely, that since the Reformation it has never been

> 'at the mercy of that class of human being which avowedly or covertly lays claim to be the embodiment of spiritual authority.'

Of course, the Church of England, like every other Christian Church, claims Jesus Christ as its head, the object of its supreme loyalty. The Royal Supremacy, however, in no way interferes with this claim of loyalty to Christ. It is no Protestant Papacy. According to Lord Charnwood :—

> 'The Royal Supremacy meant fundamentally not the creation of an upstart and obviously contemptible spiritual authority concentrated in particular human beings, which would tend to make Christianity as petrified a thing as Mohammedanism. The reformed English Church attached itself with reverence to the real authority of a Christian tradition, undefined and unformulated and incapable of any decisive exposition, but none the less living for that, a slowly growing, continuously modified, thing, operative in the hearts and minds of endless succeeding generations,' depending 'not on any doctrine whatsoever, nor on any disciplinary system whatsoever, but on communion in mere love and veneration for the person and the spirit, however vaguely and however erroneously conceived, of Jesus Christ.'

This, although passages in our Church formularies may be patient of another interpretation, we regard as in the main a true description of the religion of the average English Churchman, be he statesman or schoolmaster, soldier or sailor, peasant or landholder, and in that sense it may be said to be the religion of the Church of England.

Someone described Charles Kingsley as 'a layman in clerical dress.' That, we believe, is a sound description of the typical English clergyman. Neither the Hildebrandine conception of a sacerdotal priesthood, nor the Puritan conception of a Christian ministry of peculiarly holy dedicated persons, has been historically the ministerial ideal of the English Church, although there is doubtless room for both these ministerial ideals within its borders. Its typical clergy have not been priests possessed of supernatural powers, nor dedicated personalities endowed with exceptional spiritual graces, but Christian laymen, conscious of possessing neither unique spiritual powers nor superior

personal sanctity, but regarding their ordination as a serious obligation to perform certain religious, moral and social duties for the English nation.

It is this free, undogmatic, comprehensive, laic, and yet Christian, spirit which has been the subconscious yet subtly penetrating spirit of the reformed Church of England, and has given to it, as Lord Charnwood rightly asserts, 'a peculiarly far-reaching influence on life and thought,' and has made it

> 'the community in whose ministrations earnest men and women, who cannot honestly adhere to the creeds of any Church, have found on the whole most help.'

Lord Charnwood does not want the Church of England to cease to feel that it has an obligation to appeal to such persons and also to those multitudes outside organized Christianity upon whose minds

> 'it ought now to be dawning that there is only one really foolish attitude towards religion, and that is indifference; that a life without private prayer or association with others in worship is after all a maimed life for man or woman.'

These persons, let it be remembered by our Church authorities, can only be won to become practising members of a religious communion which is as comprehensive and tolerant as it is free from obscurantism and dogmatism. A Church policy which, while it vigorously achieves pressing practical reforms, yet preserves and develops the true spirit of the National Church, promises much for the moral and spiritual welfare of the English nation.

The Advance of Modernism

The latest Pastoral Letter[1] of the Bishop of Zanzibar has doubtless relieved the minds of not a few loyal Anglicans. The Bishop makes it clear that whatever attraction the Roman Church may have for some Anglicans, it has none for him. The reason for this is of no little interest to Modernists. The Bishop detects the influence of Modernism in the Roman Church. This influence is apparent not merely in the writings of Roman scholars, where perhaps it might be ignored, but in the policy of the Roman authorities. The definition of Papal Infalli-

[1] Published by Mowbrays.

bility is interpreted in a Modernist spirit by eminent Roman ecclesiastics. The Bishop writes:—

> "The modern Romans make as free with the Vatican definition as do liberal critics with the Nicene definition. They interpret it in accordance with the modern mind. I submit then that Rome cannot give us any real certainty in matters of faith and morals beyond what we already possess. We all know what she knows. It is our common heritage. To submit to her is not to gain more certain knowledge. It is, merely, to pledge ourselves to believe a new definition, dated 1870, which, in fact, none of her literate children to-day really accept at all. . . . From this I draw the conclusion that Rome, which is for ever offering us safety from liberalism, is herself suffering from the same disease. The Hensons of the Roman Church sit on thrones, too, ruling their dioceses. What the Bishop of Hereford does for the Apostles' Creed, they do for the Vatican definitions. Rome and Lambeth have alike surrendered to the forces of liberalism. May God save them both!'

It is, as the Bishop rightly judges, the spirit of rationalism in the Roman Church which is the cause of its modernism, even as it is the cause of Anglican liberalism. In short, the modern mind in the modern Christian is the root of the trouble. But does not the Great Commandment run: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and *with all thy mind* . . . '? How can a modern-minded man, if he is to love God with all his mind, love Him with a mind which is not of his own age? The Bishop of Zanzibar does not answer that question, but until he can answer it in such a way as to show how a modern-minded man can obey the Great Commandment, he must expect to see the growth of Modernism in every vital Christian communion. As that modern mind becomes universal in the Christian Church, and with the advance of modern education it is bound to become so, perhaps the Bishop will recall the sentence from St. Augustine which assisted the conversion of John Henry Newman, *securus judicat orbis terrarum*—'he judges safely who has all mankind with him'—and recognising its application to the modern religious situation will become a Modernist himself. That indeed were a consummation devoutly to be wished. Otherwise it must shortly be a case of 'They are all out of step except our John.'

A Voice from the Navy

In a series of brief articles in the *Church Pennant*, the official organ of the Naval Church Society, Surgeon Comman-

der Rowan Robinson deals with Church Reform on modern lines. He urges the need for allowing modern thought and modern knowledge much greater scope in the teaching of Church doctrine, and expresses the feeling of many laymen as to the cause of the Church's extreme conservatism in this connection. He writes :—

> 'Many of the laity consider that the education of the clergy is defective in being too narrow and sectarian, and confined too much to purely theological subjects.'

His view of the question of reunion is that of the great majority of Christian laymen. He writes :—

> 'Arnold has said, "I make much of the difference between Christian and non-Christian, but I attach less and less importance to the difference between Christian and Christian." This feeling is, I suppose, very general among the laity, and the war has brought it into special prominence. Yet too often the clergy help to maintain our unhappy divisions by making much of doubtful and trivial points of doctrine, or petty details of ceremony, or by driving their Non-conformist fellow-Christians away from the Lord's Table.'

The writer of the articles urges the need for Prayer-Book revision, a reformed Lectionary (which we already have in a semi-official form), and an expurgated Hymn-book. In the case of the hymns used at services the responsibility lies with the chaplain and organist or choirmaster. So far as choirs are concerned, the aspiration expressed by the saying, 'I will sing with the voice and I will sing with the understanding also,' counts for little with them. They only care about a good tune. We should have thought that the Royal Navy was quite in a position to compile its own Hymn-book and so set an example to landsmen of what can be done in that line.

Surgeon-Commander Rowan Robinson also insists on the need for practical modern sermons. He writes :—

> 'There should also be more instruction as to the real meaning of Christianity. I wrote part of this paper in Russia, and in the Greek Church we see what a vast edifice of ornate ceremonial and complex doctrine men have built on the simple teaching of Christ, so much so, that the true meaning of His teaching seems to be almost hidden. The condition to which Bolshevism has reduced that country is too terrible for words. If the priests of the Orthodox Church had taught by precept and example a simpler and more practical Christianity, instead of devoting their time to elaborate ritual, the Church would, perhaps, not have failed so completely to stem the tide of ruin. Christ's teaching was very simple, and He evidently never intended to found an elaborate ceremonial system. We can have beauty in our services without a complicated ritual.'

WAKE UP! LAYMEN

THE passing of the Enabling Bill has potentially deprived some of the laity and not a few of the clergy of rights and privileges which they have long enjoyed. For instance, the parson's freehold and private patronage are doomed to disappear in the near future, and their disappearance will not be nearly so advantageous to the Church as many ardent reformers at present suppose. Professor Marshall has pointed out that economic and industrial policies which are immediately advantageous almost invariably prove disadvantageous in the long run, and *vice versa*. The same is true of ecclesiastical policies. This means that, as the poet remarks, 'Things are not what they seem,' and he who would really understand them must give prolonged attention to them.

The tendency of Englishmen, who are naturally inert and unsuspicious in public matters, is to lose their rights without realising that they have lost them and to complain bitterly when it is too late.

In the near future very much connected with our Church services, organizations, institutions, customs, methods, membership, government will be subjected to reconstruction. Let it be remembered that reconstruction can be of various kinds. Some reconstruction may be reform, some reconstruction may be reaction. Moreover there is a quite sufficiently powerful, active, well-organized party in the English Church to-day to assure that reconstruction shall take the form of reaction.

Do ordinary English Church people realise that? We believe that it is quite improbable that they do. It is not a gratifying thing to have to realise, because he, who realises it, is under a serious obligation to take steps to counteract the policy of reaction. Those steps do not involve great sacrifices, but they do involve the discharge of certain plain duties which the new state of affairs renders incumbent on Church people, *viz.*, the duty of enrolment, the duty of attending Church meetings regularly (even the dullest), the duty of voting, the duty of securing suitable candidates for Church offices, the duty even of accepting such posts oneself and the determination to give time and trouble to the efficient discharge of the obligations involved.

The nominal Churchman and the Liberal Churchman may have little regard for clericalism and ecclesiasticism, but let them remember these words: 'Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.' The despised clericalist who does his duty under the Enabling Act will gain a command of Church policy and Church institutions from which the inert and individualist Liberal Churchman will be shut out. There is little doubt that when the Liberal Churchman discovers that he is shut out we shall have some weeping and gnashing of teeth in the correspondence columns of the *Times* and in private letters to the editor of the *Modern Churchman*, but this will not prevent the nation from suffering moral and religious loss through dereliction of duty by large bodies of somnolent laymen. Do the laity realise this fact? *The rights of the laity to-day are potential rather than actual; an ecclesiastical bureaucracy stands ready to monopolise them.* Nothing can prevent that disaster except an active, dutiful, and educated Church electorate. The creation and maintenance of such an electorate depends upon individual effort and self-sacrifice. Two incumbents, both able and active men, were recently talking over the new conditions upon which the Church is about to enter. The one said: 'I have had all the forms of declaration printed and have arranged with the Churchwardens for getting them signed at once. I anticipate having at least 500 signatures.' The other said: 'I have done nothing. My people are of two classes—well-to-do and labourers. The well-to-do turn out at night for nothing—not even for political meetings; the labouring people only turn out for entertainments. None of my parishioners, except the Churchwardens, ever attend Church meetings in my parish.'

Every Churchman has to take to heart the lesson of the classical proverb, 'Sparta is thy lot, therefore adorn Sparta.' His parish is his Sparta. It may be very dull; his parson utterly obscurantist; his fellow parishioners hopelessly pessimistic as Churchmen but enthusiasts in the matter of Sunday golf and Sunday gardening; the Church Services, as mutilated and perpetrated in his parish church, a burden heavy to bear; yet the Churchman who desires the moral and religious

elevation of his nation must firmly and faithfully take a steady and dutiful part in the work of his parish. If he does not, he loses any moral right under the new conditions to complain. He can make Sparta whatever he and his fellow-Spartans will. 'Little children let us not love in word and in tongue, but in deed and in truth.'

But apart from parochial activities and parochial politics, it will be absolutely necessary for some years to come for those whose Church ideals are those of the Churchmen's Union to maintain an influential organization in every diocese in order to secure and promote the vital interests of English religion as they understand it. We believe that whether the English race is to be Christian in the future depends upon the form in which the Christian Religion is constantly presented to it. If that form be truthful, progressive, reasonable, predominantly moral and practical, England will remain a Christian country, but if that form be obscurantist, dogmatic, reactionary, England will become, like France, a nation of which the greater part of the male population is frankly sceptical if not actually anti-Christian.

The Churchmen's Union has done useful work in the past. It has to-day a membership and influence which belongs to no other Liberal Church society. We must not here recount the form which its activities have taken nor attempt to estimate the exact scope of its influence for good, but it must be apparent to any thoughtful observer of English Church life, that, as the result of recent legislation, an enormously increased sphere of usefulness is opening up to the Churchmen's Union. Its ideals and activities are more than ever needful. But to seize this great opportunity, increased membership and increased funds are needed; more numerous branches and better attended meetings are requisite. The work of the Churchmen's Union is both educational and organizing, and there is great scope here for lay activities. We look to younger men and women to carry on and make the ideals of the Churchmen's Union the ideals of the Church of England of the future.

There is nothing to prevent their doing this, if they will throw themselves into the work. But the end is not to be attained except by prolonged and resolute endeavour.

MODERNISM AND THE CREEDS

By the Rev. R. F. Cardale, M.A.

WHAT has been said in my article in the December *Modern Churchman* makes it sufficiently clear that to Modernists historical statements or theological dogmas cannot be regarded as above discussion : it cannot be assumed that the mind of the Church is finally made up and closed in reference to them even though they are enshrined in the Creeds, which are reverenced by believers because they have through so many centuries embodied the revelation of God in Christ.

The Modernist's position is that to place the Creeds in a sphere which is beyond discussion and to refuse to submit them to the test of experience, is ultimately to destroy their authority : for authority is the result of a free consensus brought about by the Holy Spirit operating through the consciences and reasons of the faithful. Further, the authority of the Creeds must be destroyed if, while nominally they are regarded as being subject to free discussion and criticism, the Church claims the power to determine beforehand what the results of such discussion and criticism may be. There can be no freedom of discussion and no free consensus can be achieved under any such conditions as these. Again, if the Modernist distinction between Content and Form is not admitted and it is claimed that the Creed as it stands is the essential faith of a Christian, infallibly revealed and perfectly expressed for all time, both as to statements of doctrine and of historic fact—discussion and criticism are clearly unnecessary and presumptuous. Conscience may demand a disinterested and courageous facing of facts and examination of evidence. Reason may protest that what claims to be an historical statement must submit to historical criticism. But the voices of conscience and reason must be silenced.

Here then in regard to the Creeds the two conceptions of authority—as external and autocratic, or inward and free—come into violent collision. The Church of England would seem at the present time to be in the midst of the painful and difficult process of transition from the one to the other. The present position could not be better illustrated than by the Resolution of the Upper House of Convocation passed on April 30th, 1914. I quote from the Bishop of Ely's *Belief and Creed* :—

> 'Inasmuch as there is reason to believe that the minds of many members of the Church of England are perplexed and disquieted at the present time in regard to certain questions of faith and of Church Order, the Bishops of the Upper House of the Province of Canterbury feel it to be their duty to put forth the following resolution :—
>
> '1. We call attention to the Resolution which was passed in this House on May 10, 1905, as follows :—
>
> "That this House is resolved to maintain unimpaired the Catholic Faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation as contained in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds and in the Quicunque Vult, and regard the Faith there presented, both in statements of doctrine and in statements of fact, as the necessary basis on which the teaching of the Church reposes."
>
> 'We further desire to direct attention afresh to the following Resolution which was unanimously agreed to by the Bishops of the Anglican Communion attending the Lambeth Conference of 1908 :
>
> "The Conference, in view of tendencies widely shown in the writings of the present day, hereby places on record its conviction that the historical facts stated in the Creeds are an essential part of the Faith of the Church."
>
> 2. These Resolutions we desire solemnly to reaffirm, and in accordance therewith we express our deliberate judgment that the *denial* of any of the historical facts stated in the Creeds goes beyond the limits of legitimate interpretation, and gravely imperils that sincerity of profession which is plainly incumbent on the Ministers of the Word and Sacraments. At the same time, recognising that our generation is called to face new problems raised by historical criticism, we are anxious not to lay unnecessary burdens upon consciences, nor unduly to limit freedom of thought and enquiry among clergy or among laity. We desire therefore to lay stress on the need of considerateness in dealing with that which is tentative and provisional in the thought and work of earnest and reverent students.'

Now clearly if the Creeds, both as statements of doctrine and statements of fact, are the *necessary basis* upon which the teaching of the Church reposes, if the historical facts as stated in the Creeds are an *essential part* of the Faith of the Church, those who cannot definitely accept them should, in the judg-

ment of the Bishops and of the first meeting of the Upper House of the Province of Canterbury, resign their office as teachers in the Church. Modernism is ruled out. Its first principle that there is a distinction between the essential content of revelation and its unessential form is, so far as the Creed is concerned, denied. The Creed must be accepted as it stands. It either has infallible authority where it makes a historical statement: or else the necessary basis of the Church's teaching is something which is not certainly true. The Creed both in its statements of doctrine and statements of fact is lifted above the sphere of discussion altogether.

But in the Meeting of 1914 a new element is introduced. It is only explicit denial which is described as 'going beyond the limits of legitimate interpretation.' The new problems raised by historical criticism are recognised: it is admitted that our generation is called upon to face them. The Bishops have no desire '*unduly*' (whatever that may mean) to limit freedom of thought and enquiry among clergy or laity. They desire to lay stress on the need of considerateness in dealing with that which is tentative and provisional in the work of earnest and reverent students.

They have not receded, of course, from their previous judgment that the historical statements are an essential part of the faith: but that judgment now appears as an opinion which is open to discussion. It may be discussed and questioned though not denied.

Such a position, it seems to me, is clearly transitional. Once admit freedom of discussion in Theology and you must admit it altogether: there is no stopping place until you reach the Modernist conception of Theology as a Science whose methods are the same as those of other Sciences. Admit discussion and you cannot predetermine its conclusions: the autocratic conception of authority with its *a priori* methods is abandoned.

The Bishops show in this Resolution that they are pulled in two directions. They are most reluctant to discourage earnest and reverent research: they feel a profound sympathy with the intellectual difficulties with which students have to contend. Yet they shrink from admitting that Theology is a science which

requires complete freedom for its researches if its conclusions are to have scientific authority. The Encyclical Letter of the same Bishops who passed this Resolution tells us quite candidly what they are afraid of.

> 'Many in our days have rashly denied the importance of these facts, but the ideas which these facts have in part generated and have always expressed, cannot be dissociated from them. Without the historic Creeds, the ideas would evaporate into unsubstantial vagueness, and Christianity would be in danger of degenerating into a nerveless altruism.'

To Modernists this seems to be *not faith but fear*. It amounts to this:—We cannot face the possibility that any historical statement contained in the Creed may be incorrect, for fear of the disastrous consequences which would, in our opinion, follow, if it were shown to be so. This is obscurantism, not the faith that overcomes the world.

Again, if the Christian Faith were to be dissociated from history altogether, it might well evaporate into unsubstantial vagueness; but why it should do so if the traditional view of the history came to be modified in view of fresh evidence or as the result of the application to it of more scientific methods, is exceedingly difficult to understand.

The historic Creeds were not in existence in the first century, but the Bishops would be the last to suggest that in those primitive times Christianity could be described as a 'nerveless altruism.' It is not even certain by any means that St. Paul and St. John and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews knew of the Virgin Birth, but it is quite certain that there was no 'unsubstantial vagueness' about their Christianity. The Bishop of Ely defends in a most interesting and suggestive way, as it seems to me, the theory that the author of the Fourth Gospel knew of the Virgin Birth. The intense earnestness and sincerity of his book is most impressive. His exegesis of the New Testament is often convincing, and in this sphere he is clearly a master: but when he refers 'to the desire which some feel to sublimate and to resolve into ideas, those things in the past and in the future which Christian people have always regarded as events already realised or to be realised hereafter,' I for one cannot help feeling that he fails to understand the position of many Modernists. The demand for freedom to

modify, if necessary, in the light of evidence, the traditional view as to what the events were or will be, is not the same thing at all as the desire to sublimate and resolve events into ideas.

It is often said that it is the miraculous element in the Creed to which Modernism objects. It is only necessary here to add a few words upon this point.

The old idea of Miracle as a contradiction of Natural Law in the physical order has been very generally abandoned. It is now commonly asserted by upholders of the orthodox position that miracles are *non contra naturam sed contra notam naturam.* God, in fact, never acts in a lawless arbitrary way, but owing to the narrow limits of our knowledge, we are not always able to see the law in accordance with which He is acting. When this is so we call His act a miracle. No Modernist could object to miracle as so defined. Further, the principle that the so-called 'lower' law is in these cases taken up into and assimilated by the operation of the 'higher' law is unexceptionable from their point of view. But when it is taken for granted of a particular event, that it happened in a certain way, because Tradition asserts that it so happened, and when to reconcile such an occurrence with modern scientific views of the universe, it is assumed that if our knowledge were complete, we should find that this occurrence was perfectly natural—then Modernists may wish to interpose with a query.

You cannot assume anything in regard to the unknown. To assert that an event is really consistent with an unknown Nature is equivalent to saying that this Nature is not unknown : it is to make a definite assertion about it. *We cannot make ignorance the basis of knowledge.* Modernists surely have reason on their side when they claim sometimes, in the face of pre-scientific tradition, the right to be agnostic as to the way in which certain events occurred.

A word must be added in answer to the accusation of dishonesty which is sometimes made against Modernists because they claim the right to repeat the Creeds without committing themselves to an assertion of positive belief in the literal sense of every clause. The purpose of a Creed when it is used in the worship of the Church is to be an expression of belief in the Faith of the Incarnation in which all can unite. If there

is to be such a common form it is impossible that the shades of individual and sectional opinion should be expressed in it. When the autocratic conception of authority, based upon infallibility, prevailed, these shades of individual opinion had, of course, no recognised right to exist. But such absolute uniformity becomes more and more impossible as human education progresses. As things are, if honesty forbids the repetition in public worship of any Creed which does not literally express the individual views of the worshipper, honesty forbids the use of Creeds in worship altogether. For though all the worshippers believe the Faith of the Incarnation, no two of them would, if left to themselves, express it in the same words. Modernists, then, claim that they have a perfect right to use the words as representing the Faith which they share with their fellow-believers as long as they share it. The form of its expression must be left to the Church, not to the individual. And it is inevitable that its wording will always express most accurately the views of the most conservative members of the Church, since 'the pace of the fleet must be that of the slowest ship.'

Constructive Modernists have no desire to deny dogmatically the historical statements contained in the Creed. They only claim that as historical statements they are essential to the Faith, only if it can be shown that Christian experience was made possible by them: and that the mere fact of their inclusion in a Creed formed before the advent of scientific historical criticism is insufficient to establish their accuracy.

There is yet another objection to Modernism so frequently made that it is necessary to refer to it, however briefly. It has no message, so it is alleged, for simple folk, but on the contrary puts stumbling blocks in their way, and disturbs their simple faith.

There are occasions when reality in religion is only to be gained at the cost of considerable disturbance of mind: times when men can remain undisturbed only by refusing to face facts. Whenever there has been a considerable or rapid development of general knowledge, when fresh facts have been brought to light, it becomes necessary to modify the form in which religious truth is embodied. The task inevitably causes

disturbance and distress of mind to many for a time, but it is a task which cannot be shirked without disaster. Probably simple or uncultured people do not feel the strain of such changes or realise their significance as much as is commonly supposed. They are concerned with Religion rather than with Theology. But they have a keen instinct for reality. There is a danger lest Religion should be discredited for them because it is associated in their minds with ideas which are quite inconsistent with the elementary scientific teaching they have received. If they are never taught or encouraged to *think* about their religion, they are apt to be at the mercy of the first sceptic they come across. One reason why Institutional Religion has lost its hold upon men is undoubtedly that they have got a vague idea that the Bible is proved false by Science, that the Churches won't face facts, and that the clergy continue to teach Christianity, not because they believe it to be true, but because they are paid for doing so.

The fear of disturbing the minds of simple people is largely responsible for this disastrous state of affairs. The blame cannot be laid at the door of Modernism, which is an attempt to meet difficulties which Science has already raised. It is true that the pulpit is in most parishes very unsatisfactory as a place for enlightening men's minds upon such matters. There is no possibility of discussion. The congregation consists of people in every stage of development. The preacher is almost bound to concentrate upon practical teaching. The Church must create other opportunities through classes and study circles. But the important fact to realise is that people's minds are disturbed, if indeed they have not already settled down to a definite rejection of Christian doctrine, public worship and Institutional religion. These need to be disturbed, as also surely do many regular attendants at our places of worship, whose minds have become so encrusted with convention that until they are disturbed they will remain practically unteachable and impervious to the truths which in these critical days God is seeking to teach them. As a rule, the disturbance should be gradually effected by positive teaching which awakens thought and questioning, though prophetic teachers may sometimes feel themselves called to make direct

attacks upon conventional faith and ignorant prejudice. Modernism, however, is not committed either to the positive or to the negative method; the Church may well need both. Modernism seeks to meet the present situation, first by concentrating attention upon essential religion and distinguishing it from its theological embodiment, and secondly by insisting that the theology in which it is embodied should be scientific. It is *essential religion*, the experience of the love and power of the living Christ, that the simple people need and can appreciate: it is a *scientific theology* that educated people require. If on the other hand the Church neglects the thoughtful and cultured in the supposed interests of the simple folk, she will inevitably find herself rejected by both: for ultimately it is the thinkers who shape the common mind.

INDUSTRIAL PROBLEMS AND THEIR CHRISTIAN SOLUTION

By the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Carlisle.

IN considering the relation of Christianity to our industrial problems and to the prevalent unrest, it is necessary to have our minds perfectly clear as to the nature and purpose of Christianity. Of course the best, and indeed the only true and authentic, account of what Christianity is, and is meant to achieve, is to be found in the New Testament. Gospel Christianity, as found in the New Testament, is great in Faith, great in Hope, but greatest of all in Love. The root of Christianity is Love, its flower is Love, its fruit is Love. Whatsoever has not Love for its seed, Love for its soil, Love for its harvest, is anti-Christian. The beginning of Christianity's existence is in the love of God for man, and its end and purpose are to promote man's love for God and for his fellow-men. Whatsoever is not of love, however ancient its traditions or logical its dogmas, is not of Christ and therefore is not Christian.

The two foundations upon which Christ built the whole structure of His religion were the fatherly love of God and the brotherly love of men. It is very striking how intimately and integrally Christ identifies his religion with His great revelation of the Fatherhood of God. Other religions, and indeed some abnormal forms of the Christian religion also, are mainly built and largely characterised by exclusiveness in some form or degree. But Christ sums up His redemptive revelations for mankind in the proclamation of the universal Fatherhood of God and the universal Brotherhood of men. His whole life, including the Cross and the empty Tomb, was divinely intended as a glorious Epiphany of the unsearchable Love of God the Father in thus sending His Son to redeem the world. According to Christ, prayer is the communion of children with their Father. Repentance is the prodigal's return to his Father. Forgiveness flows from the Father's love. Almsgiving and all spiritual discipline should be practised as in the presence of the Father. Baptism is the sacramental adoption to the Father's family. The Lord's Supper is the perpetual memorial of the Father's love, manifested in the self-sacrifice of His only begotten Son, and is also the bond and nourishment of brotherly fellowship between all His disciples. His grand eucharistic prayer was a divine appeal to the Father that there might be the same unity among His disciples as there was unity among the three Persons in the Godhead. Death, too, according to Christ, is departure to the Father. Immortality is endless life in the many mansions of the Father's House. Thus whatever is inconsistent with the perfect Fatherhood of God is inconsistent with Christianity, as revealed by Christ.

The second foundation upon which Christ built the structure of His religion was the Brotherhood of men, without respect of station, or talents, or possessions, or vocation. Nothing is more remarkable in Christianity as revealed by Christ than its essential difference in this respect from all other religions of the world. Christ permits no exclusive distinctions to exist among His disciples. However different they may be in gifts and graces, in talents and possessions, they are all regarded as brethren, because they are all children of the one Father.

Christ does not make in His Gospel any distinction of spiritual rank among His disciples; as one of His apostles said 'all alike are kings and priests unto God.' It is most remarkable and full of significance how the entire sacerdotal nomenclature attaching to Pagan religions and so frequently found in Old Testament Scriptures, is entirely absent from the New Testament teachings. Such terms as Priests, in the sense of sacrificial priests, and Mediator, as distinct from Intercessor, are never used in the New Testament, except with reference to Christ Himself. In one of His most searching parables our Lord represented the heretical Samaritan as a better brother to the wounded traveller than either priest or Levite, thus foreshadowing the great Christian truth that all forms of class interest, including those of the priestly class, are inimicable to the welfare and progress of the brotherhood of men.

The other day I received a letter from a distinguished clergyman, whose labours amongst the poor are well known throughout English-speaking Christendom, in which he says how terrible it is to him to find that, whereas the large bulk of the labouring classes 'adore the Christ, yet they affirm that they have no use for the Churches.' There must be some tremendous cause for this indifference of vast classes of persons to official religion, while at the same time they honour and adore Christ as Lord. And I believe that the fundamental cause of this indifference, as well as of the general inability of so many of the churches to guide the thoughts and actualise the ideals of the masses of men, is that official religion is too much involved in and permeated with such ecclesiastical and even spiritual distinctions. Not a few of the Labour leaders are godly men, profoundly realising that our industrial and social problems are at bottom religious problems. But it is noteworthy how comparatively few of these leaders belong to any Christian communion in which the difference between priest and layman is emphasised.

We need, therefore, it seems to me, to rebuild and reconstruct our traditional forms of Christianity afresh upon the two foundations laid by Christ, *viz.*, the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Men. No other foundations of the kind, which St. Paul calls hay and stubble foundations, as distinct

from those two rock-foundations of the incarnate Lord, can stand the test of time and support the fabric of human life, either in its individual or collective forms, against the storms with which it is continuously assailed. Wars, whether militarist, ecclesiastical, or industrial, will never cease until the life of all men and nations and churches is founded upon these two rocks laid by Christ. For whence come all our present wars and woes? Do they not spring from the spirit of exclusiveness and pride in precedence, from the absence of genuine conviction that God is the Father of all, and that men without respect of persons, station, talents or possessions, priests or laymen, are brethren? It is the Christian Brotherhood of man, co-operating with the Divine Fatherhood of God, which alone can make wars to cease throughout the world, and bring in the reign of peace and goodwill amongst men.

I look, therefore, for the solution of all our ecclesiastical, our social, and our industrial problems to the divine influence of these two great revelations of the Christ. When every Church realises that the members of every other Church are brethren in the Lord, denomination will cease to devour denomination, nations will turn the swords of envy and greed and arrogance into the ploughshares of mutual help and service; masters will no longer sweat their workers, or withhold from them the full and proper share in the results of their labour, and workmen of every class, whether mental or manual, will realise that capital, rightly used and justly shared, is not their foe but their friend.

As one strong aid to the realization of the brotherhood of men, we need to introduce a larger social element into our religious life. Inside our churches we have a common Font for all, common scriptures, a common Table of our Lord, but outside our churches we do not practise as we should Christian comradeship and fellowship. During the war, this sense of comradeship was strongly nourished on the fields of battle; and I sincerely trust that the work of the Church Army and the Y.M.C.A. will, by establishing social centres throughout the land, greatly help in the culture and spread of social fellowship and brotherly love among all Christians. Moreover one further great need for the solution of our industrial problems is the

elevation of work of all kinds to its proper dignity. It is not surprising that when manual labour has been so long associated with traditions of serfdom, and the earning of men's livelihood has been so frequently a joyless drudgery, work, and especially manual work, has come to be thought of as a task to be shunned as much as possible. But this way of regarding work is diametrically opposed to the teachings of Christ. In the Scriptures the sweat of work is indeed associated with sin, but the habit of work is associated with salvation. Christ has told us that His Father is always working, and that He Himself is ever working with His Father. This surely unfolds to us the true Christian attitude towards work. Every kind of honest work should be regarded as work done in co-operation with God, and therefore every form of wilful indolence, and especially luxurious indolence, should be regarded as sin and godlessness. It is also noteworthy that the work of God is always for the sake of others, never for His own advantage. Human work in this respect differs from work purely divine, inasmuch as we have first of all to work for our own livelihood. But the larger the social element which we can introduce into our work—*i.e.* the more clearly we realize that our work contributes to the well-being and happiness of our fellows,—the more closely will our work resemble that of the divine Worker, and the more happiness will it bring to ourselves.

So I conclude, as far as I am able to see, that the only true and sufficient solution of all the problems which perplex mankind is to be found, and found only, in the realization that all men are sons of the universal Father, and that therefore all men are brethren, and that being brethren we should bear, as far as we can, one another's burdens, and promote to the utmost of our powers one another's happiness and do all our work with all our might to the glory of God. My earnest hope and confident belief is that the clergy and laity of our beloved Church, joining hands with all other Christian people, will in the ages yet to come do right royal service in proclaiming and practising the glorious ideals contained in these two great revelations of the Gospel of Christ our Lord.

PROBLEMS OF CLERICAL POVERTY

THE small stipends of not a few of the parochial clergy have been so greatly reduced by high prices and heavy taxes that many cases of acute clerical poverty are occurring. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners have given grants; a limited number of the laity have given donations; the Bishop of Liverpool has surrendered half his official income; but notwithstanding these efforts at relief, the financial prospects of many of the clergy are deplorable.

It is obvious that a tinkering policy will not remedy the situation; drastic reforms in our system of Church finance are needed. We require a re-distribution of parochial endowments and a great alteration in parochial boundaries by means of which a fair week's pay will be provided for a fair week's work. It seems clear also that we need a somewhat different method of administration of the funds controlled by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and a more adequate scheme of clerical pensions. Canon Headlam has outlined our financial needs and has indicated various means by which it might be possible to provide for them. We believe that with some modifications his proposals are sound. If the carrying of them out led to the scrapping of the Central Board of Finance that might not be the least advantageous of their results.

It is plain, however, that to appeal to the laity for financial help on behalf of the clergy is a vain proceeding until the Church has reformed her system of parochial finance. When financial assistance, we have little doubt, will be forthcoming financial assistance, we have little doubt, will be forthcoming from the Church's laity—the most generous body of laity in Christendom.

We cannot disguise from ourselves the fact that the relief of clerical poverty must effect changes which will cause no little pain and protest among both clergy and laity. The amalgamation of small country parishes; the alteration of parochial boundaries; the reduction of the number of services

in ancient parish churches; the selling of picturesque vicarages and old-world rectories, and the housing of the clergy in modern cottages and semi-detached villas; the diminishing of the income of the richer town and country parishes so that no parish shall be financially more desirable than its neighbours; these and like changes, which only the dire poverty of the clergy demands, cannot be achieved except in a spirit which is resolved to cast all sentiment to the winds. We detest the thought of many of these changes; they will have injurious effects in a number of unforeseen ways; they will destroy much of the charm of rural clerical life. All we ask is that, if they be really necessary, as it appears they are, they shall be carried out with courage and justice and as quickly as possible. We have never regarded financial reform as the most important of Church reforms, but it is certainly the most pressing reform to-day, and we hope that there will be no delay now that the Church has secured self-government. Where the need is so urgent we should wish to protest against a possible method of financial reform which seems to us altogether objectionable. Grievous delay and incalculable suffering have been produced in Europe by President Wilson's resolute insistence that the formation of the League of Nations and the conclusion of Peace with Germany be operated together instead of apart. We fear lest our ecclesiastical bureaucrats may adopt a similar policy. We know how much they are opposed to the parson's freehold and private patronage. Any form of personal independence and private initiative is obnoxious to the bureaucrat, especially to the ecclesiastical bureaucrat. Shall we not have some of this fraternity insisting that the poverty of the clergy cannot be relieved unless the clergy are ready to consent to the abolition of the parson's freehold and private patronage? This has been the policy of some of the promoters of the Enabling Bill, who have insisted that no instalment of Church reform by *ad hoc* legislation was possible until the Enabling Bill was passed, so we fear lest we shall next be told that financial relief of clerical poverty cannot be undertaken unless the beneficed clergy and private patrons consent to sacrifice their ancient rights. If this policy be adopted, it must mean not only delay, but also the creation of an atmosphere of distrust and resent-

ment. We would therefore urge most strongly that the relief of clerical poverty be treated by itself, and that the policy of 'tacking' be avoided in formulating measures for its relief.

This does not mean that broad views must not be taken of the situation, but such views need not hinder our authorities from taking immediate steps to relieve clerical poverty. We feel, for instance, that our authorities ought to consider seriously whether so large a number of clergy is needful for the maintenance of the Christian Religion in this country, and whether, with all the demands for religious, charitable and social objects in England and outside it made upon the generosity of English Churchmen, they can possibly afford to contribute annually the large sums for the maintenance of the clergy which the new scale of payment may seem to make necessary.

Of course, the clergy might be paid less if the English people would consent to have a celibate clergy—and if a celibate clergy of a good type could be obtained—but there is no desire for a celibate clergy among English Churchmen, and considering the number of eminent men who have been the sons of clergymen, this is not surprising—so there is no need to consider the creation of a celibate clergy as a cheap way of relieving clerical poverty and the layman's pocket. Before the social revolution another method of relieving clerical poverty might have been suggested, *viz.*, that ordinands should be selected from the labouring classes, and, having been educated and trained at the expense of the Church, would be willing, after ordination, to accept a labouring man's wages and live in the style of a labouring man but without his beer and amusements. But when dockers are demanding 16/- a day as their minimum wage, it is plain that to draw our future ministry from the labouring classes, whatever its advantages from the point of view of influence with the proletariat, would present few financial advantages. A ministry of colliers, dockers and artizans would certainly demand a larger average stipend than a ministry consisting of sons of the clergy.

There are other solutions that may well be considered. Why should not a number of the clergy support themselves by practising other callings? At present, except as schoolmasters, tutors, and writers, this is not possible. The

clergy are prohibited by the Canons from pursuing secular callings, but why could not a large number of our lawyers, journalists, bankers, merchants, civil service officials, and other members of the educated classes, become honorary clergymen? They would earn their living by their week-day secular occupation, and devote their Sundays and some of their week-day leisure to the duties of the Christian Ministry. The Rev. Roland Allen has, we believe, advocated this, especially for the work of the foreign mission field, but we are of opinion that there is quite as much to be said in its favour in the home-field. We believe that it would strengthen the influence of the Christian ministry enormously and help to deprive it of its caste character and somewhat doctrinaire treatment of many practical and social questions. This remedy would entail a great increase in the numbers of the clergy, as they would be less than a half-time clergy, but a large body of clergy of this kind would be an unspeakable advantage. The relations between the paid and unpaid ministry would no doubt present problems, and the tendency would be to subordinate the unpaid to the paid ministry, but this we believe would be a mistake. Some of the higher clergy, such as bishops, would have to be paid because they would have to be whole-timers; but there are other cases where the paid clergy might work in subordination to the honorary clergy. We hope that the experiment will be made on a large scale. Important parishes might be handed over to them and a large measure of freedom and initiative granted in administrative posts. We believe this to be a more promising move than the development of the honorary lay reader system. All who have worked, especially in the Dominions, know the enormous debt which the Church owes to the honorary lay-readers; but that system, especially in England, needs supplementing. The worst way of supplementing it is by developing an organization of salaried lay-readers or salaried Scripture-readers and lay evangelists. We believe that while the system of honorary lay-readers should be maintained and encouraged and as far as possible developed, a system of honorary secular clergymen should be introduced at once, and on large-hearted, courageous lines. We need to have far less official red tape in the conferring of Holy Orders, and at the same time far more

care taken that Holy Orders are conferred only on those who are above, not below, the average.

We have not space to consider here the considerable accession of strength to the ministry of the Church which will become possible when public opinion in this country regards women as suitable to take a public part in the services of the Church. The Synagogue, under the influence of the Church, has recently permitted a woman to preach, although the devout Jew thanks God weekly in his synagogue services that he was not born a woman. We may therefore expect that women, who at present do so much unpaid Church work in subordinate positions, will as honorary clergy, not many years hence, as they justify their admission to Parliament and other exalted public positions, be permitted to assist the Church to discharge its ministerial functions without burdening its exchequer.

Hence, while the pressing financial needs of the clergy ought to be relieved immediately, the authorities of the Church ought not to regard the matter as settled with the relief of those financial needs. The Church needs a large voluntary and honorary ministry to-day: there is much material at hand to provide it. We hope our authorities will act.

May we add that in providing the incomes of the parochial clergy we are strongly of opinion that, while the bulk of the income of the parish priest should be derived from endowments, there should also be a considerable percentage derived from the voluntary offerings of the parishioners and congregation? George Augustus Selwyn, the first and greatest Bishop of New Zealand, desired in every parish that half the clergyman's income should be derived from endowments and half from the parishioners' contributions. The Church in the Dominion could not at that time secure the endowments, but the general principle is excellent. It provides that the parish priest is neither wholly dependent upon, nor wholly independent of, his parishioners. It means also that the parishioners, mindful of our Lord's saying that 'the labourer is worthy of his hire,' feel a Christian obligation to give of their substance to his maintenance where he gives all his time and energy in ministering to their religious, moral and social needs.

'PRIVATE VICES' AND 'PUBLIC BENEFITS'*

By the Very Rev. W. R. Inge, D.D., C.V.O., Dean of St. Paul's.

'From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members?'
—James iv, 1.

IN the year 1723 Dr. Bernard Mandeville, a physician, published a book which became famous, called *The Fable of the Bees, or Private Vices, Public Benefits.* The fable described a hive of bees, who after growing wealthy and great by the practice of fraud and luxury, agreed to turn honest, and lost everything. This flippant essay provoked a reply from William Law, the author of the *Serious Call,* one of the most powerful and virile minds that the Church of England has ever produced. Of this reply John Sterling, a competent critic, says that it is 'one of the most remarkable philosophical essays he has ever seen in English.' Law does not argue at length that in the history of nations private vices have not been public benefits. He goes to the root of the matter by attacking Mandeville's thesis that man is only an animal, and moral virtue only an imposture; that human nature is but 'a compound of various passions, which govern him by turns, whether he will or no.' 'The province,' says Law, 'which you have chosen for yourself is to deliver man from the encroachments of virtue and to replace him in the rights and privileges of brutality; to recall him from the giddy heights of rational dignity and angelic likeness to go to grass or wallow in the mire.' Which is the truth? This estimate of human nature or that of the Book of Genesis: 'God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness'—a 'declaration of the dignity of man's nature, made long before any of your sagacious moralists had a meeting.' What

* A sermon preached in the Temple Church, December, 1919.

are we to say about the origin of virtue? 'In one sense it had no origin—that is, there never was a time when it began to be—but it was as much without beginning as truth and goodness, which are in their natures as eternal as God. But moral virtue, if considered as the object of man's knowledge, began with the first man, and was as natural to him as it was natural to man to think and perceive or feel the difference between pleasure and pain. The reasonableness and fitness of actions themselves is a law to rational beings; nay, it is a law to which even the Divine Nature is subject, for God is necessarily good and just; and it is the will of God that makes moral virtue our law, and obliges us to act reasonably. Here, Sir, is the noble and divine origin of moral virtue; it is founded in the immutable relations of things, in the perfections and attributes of God, not in the pride of man, or the craft of cunning politicians. Away then with your idle and profane fancies about the origin of moral virtue! For once turn your eyes to heaven, and dare but own a just and good God, and then you have owned the true origin of religion and moral virtue.'

There are words and phrases here which belong to the 18th century and the controversy with the Deists. But Law's position is plain. The moral sense has an absolute sanction, being part of the nature of the God who made the world and what we call the laws of nature. Morality or virtue is and always has been natural to man, who was made in the image of God; and his social happiness here, no less than his individual happiness hereafter, is bound up with his obedience to those higher impulses which are in truth the law of his being.

The theory that private vices are public benefits has seldom been stated so crudely and offensively as it was by Mandeville. But in its essence it has often been held, defended, and acted upon. It was the source of much of the optimism of nineteenth century political thought. The business man, it was held, though his one aim in life is to make a fortune for himself or his family, is, by an admirable dispensation of Providence, doing the very best thing for his country and for the progress of mankind. In a State where everyone is personally interested in producing and offering what his neighbours want, everyone will get what he wants at the lowest price without

appealing to those lofty motives which are inoperative in the majority of men. So competition was to produce all the advantages of co-operation, having itself the great advantage of being natural to man; for we all wish to make money, and we do not all wish to help each other.

Thus our grandfathers thought that some private vices were public benefits. The opinion seemed plausible for a time; that was in fact the time when the nation was expanding most rapidly. But the beneficent consequences of keen competition were in a sense accidental, and were bound to be transitory. It was not realised that the same desire to make money which had created many useful and flourishing private businesses would after a time lead to great combinations aiming at monopolies; that the manufacturer would be swallowed up by the international banker; above all, that the wage-earners would form their own combinations against the capitalist and consumer alike. Our grandfathers regarded competition as a contest in serviceableness; as we see it, it is quite as often a conspiracy of unserviceableness. Private vices and public benefits no longer pull together; they get sadly in each other's way.

Moreover, our grandfathers seldom contemplated that acquisitiveness would organise itself so completely as to turn a whole nation into a gigantic business Trust. Yet this was exactly what was happening in Germany, and it is the logical result of the maxim 'Private vices are public benefits.' The private ambition of one nation was defended as being really a benefit to the whole world, which was to be drilled by it into greater efficiency. The Germans, however, knew that when their aims became manifest they would have to fight for them; and they determined to strike first. Hence the recent war. The private vices of nations—their patriotic aggressiveness and inordinate pride—have not proved public benefits; they have almost, if not quite, wrecked our civilization.

The doctrine which inspired Mandeville and incensed William Law has not been accepted without protest. Martineau declared that 'From "each for self" to "each for all" there is *no road*.' And Herbert Spencer pronounced the impressive warning that 'There is no political alchemy which can extract golden conduct from leaden instincts.'

But neither the warnings and protests of good and wise men, nor the terrible breakdown of civilization in the late war, have had any appreciable influence in weakening the widespread belief that through strife and envying, through hatred and malice, through greed and violence, we may arrive at a better social order than we have at present. The advocates of civil war naturally pour out the vials of their wrath against democracy, because democracy rests on the assumption that there is a common good which all citizens wish to promote, and a common law which all citizens must obey. They are equally hostile to State socialism, which demands a semi-military subordination of the individual to the State. The new doctrinaires assume an irreconcilable antagonism between classes, and hope to establish a new order by giving full scope to this antagonism.

I have not the slightest wish to preach a political sermon, or to identify Christianity with any one of the opinions on which good and sensible men are divided. But this particular type of political thought, by whatever name it calls itself, is flatly and absolutely unchristian. It has all the evils of aggressive militarism without any of the redeeming qualities which make soldiering a school of courage and discipline and self-sacrifice. It tears to pieces the country which we have come to love as we never loved it before. It degrades human nature, and poisons all the relationships which bring men together in their working hours. And surely we must see that it is a short cut to national suicide. How can a house divided against itself ever hope to stand? What bond of union is there even between the various trades which may for a time combine for war against society? How can any good come out of broken contracts, dishonest work, organised terrorism, and callous cruelty?

Was not William Law quite right when he said that the root of the whole evil is an acceptance of human nature at its worst, and a blind hope that somehow or other chaos will evolve order out of itself? If we could not find better texts in the Bible, we might well go back to the Stoics, who bravely maintained that men are framed for co-operation, not for mutual injury, and that the law of nature sanctions and demands a life of duty, obedience, and service.

What are the good things which we are not ashamed to desire for ourselves and our country? What are the things which we are not ashamed to pray for? In seeking these good things for ourselves or for others, are we driven inexorably in the direction of strife and war? Do we find that the pursuit of these things divides us into jarring and at last warring factions? Do these objects disintegrate a nation, so that it is useless to its friends and contemptible to its enemies?

On the contrary, we know that as soon as we live on the higher plane of our nature, as soon as we remember that we are children of God, redeemed by Christ, and citizens of a better world than this; as soon as the prayer 'Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done,' comes to life in our minds and shines before our eyes as an ideal and a glorious promise, we are drawn together, irrespective of class and even of nationality; as fellow-workers with God we are all fellow-workers with each other; we have no irreconcilably discrepant interests, because we are all fellow-workmen, bringing, in St. Paul's famous picture, to the building of the Temple of God, the Temple raised on the only possible foundation, Jesus Christ—bringing the diverse materials which are our life's work, in the hope that the Master-Builder will find a use for them, and that they will stand the fire on those Days of Trial, when Christ 'is sifting out the hearts of men before his judgment-seat.'

We are tired of the word 'reconstruction,' but let us dwell upon it for a moment, since it is one of St. Paul's favourite metaphors, as in the passage which was in my mind. We have to rebuild our national house, which we hope is part of the Temple of God, to be built in co-operation by all the nations of the earth. Each of us has to bring a stone, a living stone, as St. Peter says; and these living stones are ourselves, as our characters find expression in our lives. 'Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily, as to the Lord and not to men.' 'Not with eye-service, as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart fearing God.' Are we to be content to bring rotten materials to that building? Are we to hinder and injure our brother-workmen, and fight when we should be working? How can any 'reconstruction' take place under such conditions?

Christ offers us peace instead of war—'peace on earth, good will to men.' Let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to which also ye are called in one body. 'In His will,' as Dante says in a famous line, 'In His will is our peace.' Peace, which we longed for during the four glorious and terrible years of national conflict; peace, which we have longed for even more ardently through the inglorious and degrading civil troubles of this year; peace is within our reach, and on easy terms. 'If ye be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above.' Believe that human nature is not the mean and brutish thing that it sometimes appears. Believe that we were not meant to hate and devour one another, but to help each other, forgetting all those foolish barriers of class and race and sect which Christ levelled once for all. 'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you. Not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.' Are these words true, or are they not? We know that they are true, so true that we have kept them bedridden in the dormitory of our souls, and have forgotten them. It is time to bring them out. 'Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.'

FELLOWSHIP, RECOGNITION AND UNITY

THE Reunion movement is steadily growing in momentum. Two important conferences have recently been summoned to advance it. When their conclusions have been published, we shall hope to deal with them. What, however, is clear is that we English Christians must have reunion, and that we shall secure it in some form in the near future. What, however, is not so clear is whether we shall not have a schism in the Anglican Communion as the result of our efforts to secure reunion with our Nonconformist brethren.

The Bishops of Norwich and Durham have recently written to the *Times* advocating the ideal of fellowship rather than that of reunion. What we need now are better relations with

Nonconformists.' We appreciate their reasons for the suggestion and recognise their weight. In order to heal our divisions there is more need of an atmosphere and a spirit than of rigorously regulated intercourse between the separated communions at the present time. But we cannot be satisfied with the creation of this atmosphere of fellowship as though it were an ultimate thing; we must have corporate reunion as our final goal; and we believe it better policy to name this as our last objective now. Unless we do that we shall fail to secure the adhesion of many open-minded Catholics to the reunion movement.

An influential member of the Catholic party recently described the Catholic spirit in this matter as having two features; first, it desires corporate unity; secondly, it is willing to make sacrifices to secure it. Of course, it may seem in some cases more willing to make those sacrifices to Rome than to Geneva, but we are not sure that that is really the case. Until now it has seemed that Rome and the Anglo-Catholic have at least a common aim in this matter, *viz.*, corporate reunion. Also, it is this to which Protestantism has seemed indifferent. The sectarian spirit desires not unity but recognition. When it receives that it is satisfied. Recognition means that its position is justified; it is like a decoration for valour. This the Catholic cannot concede. It seems to him to be a denial of the article in the Creed: 'I believe in One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.' To concede it seems to allow that individual Christians have the right to rend the Body of Christ, and that right no Catholic can allow. Unless therefore it be asserted openly and freely that we are convinced that there ought to be outward unity among all Christians, and that that corporate outward unity is our aim and ideal in seeking to create a spirit of fellowship and co-operation, we shall fail to secure the support of open-minded Catholics without which the movement must languish and fail.

Friendly relations between the sects; unctuous phrases on public platforms; ecclesiastical amenities on national occasions; for these the Catholic feels he has no use. To him they savour of hypocrisy and unreality. They seem to gloss over what is abhorrent to him and what must be utterly disowned if right relations are to be established in the future.

The Anglo-Catholic does not ask the Protestant sectary to deny his past; or to believe that his ministry has not produced the fruits of the Spirit; or to confess that the Church from which his forefathers separated was not in a very large measure responsible for the schism. All the Catholic desires is that the act of schism, not merely a schismatical temper, but the open rending of the visible corporate unity of Christ's Church should be recognised as sinful, and that where this schism has occurred it should be confessed to be the duty of Christians to restore corporate unity.

Now if the leaders of the Reunion Movement can bring themselves to make this two-fold confession, we are convinced that many open-minded Catholics will feel able to support the movement from which at present they stand aloof because they do not see clearly what the reunionists are aiming at.

Another mark of the Catholic mind in this matter is that the symbol of unity is neither interchange of pulpits, nor the appearing together on public platforms of the representatives of the Churches, nor even united thanksgiving services in cathedrals or town halls, but the Holy Communion. This was also the view of our English Reformers whose XXVIIIth Article opens with the words:—

> 'The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves, one to another . . .'

When Christians unite in the Eucharist the outward symbol of Christian unity is manifest. Doubtless the corporate celebration of the sacrament of unity involves a number of subsidiary and preliminary details of organization and preparation, but it should be recognised that these are subsidiary, and that *here* is the place for the sacrifices which the Catholic is prepared to make. Those sacrifices are easier to make when the Catholic has a wide, and deep, and, may we add, philosophical, knowledge of Church history. A speaker at a recent reunion conference said:—

> 'If you have no knowledge of Church History at all the obstacles in the way of reunion do not seem serious; if you have a profound knowledge of Church History they do not seem serious either; but if you have as much knowledge of Church History as the average English clergyman has, the obstacles in the way of reunion seem well-nigh insuperable.'

But let us add in connection with the Holy Communion as

the ideal act of unity that the notion of 'occasional Communion' is abhorrent to the Catholic mind. Either it is a good thing that Christians at present separated should unite to celebrate the Holy Communion or it is not a good thing. If it be a good thing, then it must be established as the general rule. To have 'united Communions' now and again on great occasions, but to celebrate 'separatist Communions' on ordinary occasions is something which savours of unreality and seems to strike at the true significance of the Sacrament. We believe that it might be a good thing to discard the occasional 'united Communion' altogether as a step towards reunion.

In deciding the part which the Holy Communion should play in the reunion movement, we believe that it would be a good thing if the English Church authorities, in accordance with the views of Archbishops Tait, Benson, Temple and Maclagan, and many bishops and priests of our Church, would issue an invitatory statement to the effect that all communicants in other Christian Churches are welcome to receive the Holy Communion at our altars whenever they will. This would not seem to open-minded Catholics to be encouraging sectarian communions, and we believe that, although only a first step towards corporate reunion, it would be a wise step in the right direction.

So far we have viewed the Reunion Movement from the Catholic side, but we cannot stop there. The Free Church, or Liberal, view must be briefly stated. The Liberal Churchman has no desire to achieve reunion at the price of certain values which are more precious to him than corporate unity. In other words, if the One, Holy, Catholic, Church of the future does not retain those values he is not interested in it, and he will certainly be disposed to abandon the ideal of One, Holy, Catholic, Church for the ideal of the Kingdom of God on earth. At present he is halting at the cross-roads. He feels no enthusiasm either for an aggregate of sectarian churches nor for One, Holy, Catholic, Church which seems to him to be sectarian in its exclusiveness, unprogressive in its faith, inelastic in its methods, obscurantist in its teaching. If the Holy, Catholic, Church of the future is to command his whole-hearted loyalty, it must preserve certain fundamental values.

First, comprehensiveness: the One Church of the future must be able to admit to its membership all who call Jesus Lord and God Father. In other words, all who worship the Father in Christ and all who wish to make the principles of the Gospel of Jesus the principles of their own lives. All creeds, articles and confessions, the products of this fundamental Christian Faith, are secondary and subordinate to it. The Churchman of the future will be satisfied to say, 'I have one Master even Christ, and I am not willing to swear in the name of another, whether he be Athanasius or Augustine, Calvin or Cranmer, Thomas Aquinas or John Wesley.

With this comprehensiveness must be united freedom, by which we mean a loving, disciplined liberty, not a selfish, thoughtless, unrestrained licence. Such liberty is dependent upon interior self-control, and it is only where the Spirit of the Lord is that such liberty is found. In the Church of the future there must be liberty of thought, liberty of speech, liberty of action, liberty not merely for laymen but liberty for the clergy. Uniformity must be sacrificed to many-sided variety, and excessive variety must be subordinated to unity.

It is obvious that these values of comprehensiveness and freedom can only be preserved by simplicity of fundamentals, fewness of regulations, a spirit of Christian considerateness, and some form of democratic but constitutional government. Such a government must rest on two profound convictions, *viz.*, a belief that all the laity are priests, and that any officiating or governing ministry are but the *representatives* of the laity, and a belief in the present guidance of the Holy Spirit, and that for true progress, the solution of all practical problems, the Holy Spirit must be supplicated and obeyed. In other words, the authority in the Church must be thought of as being the possession of the Holy Spirit, not of any person or order in the Church. Thus it will be an authority from above because it will be a Divine authority, spiritual, moral, rational—not an authority expressed by the loudest voice and the most numerous votes—but by the spiritual and moral leaders of the Christian community striving to utter the monitions of the Holy Spirit. It will also be democratic, for those who interpret the Spirit's guidance will not be able to legislate in accordance with it

without having first won the consent of the Christian democracy.

If the One Catholic Church of the future is resolved to enthrone the Spirit of Love, the Spirit of Freedom, and the Spirit of Truth, instead of the Spirit of Authority, the Spirit of Uniformity, and the Spirit of Tradition, then the Liberal is altogether for corporate reunion, and such questions as whether the government of the Church of the future be episcopal or presbyterian, whether its sacraments be two or seven, whether its creeds be old or new, whether its Scriptures include or exclude the Apocrypha, will seem to him to be in no sense fundamental. He will desire, in the fullest and freest way possible, unity of spirit, unity of faith, unity of moral ideal, unity of worship in the Holy Communion, unity of organization, and he will also desire continuity wherever possible. He will be eager that the great Catholic traditions and institutions, the ancient rites and customs, should be retained in the One, Holy, Catholic, Church of the future, not as matters of obligation but as means of inspiration, links with a sacred past. But he would also desire that each local church should, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, have in its own hands the decision in these matters and the power to revise these decisions from time to time. We need most of all to-day in our conception of Church government not the test of Christian antiquity, traditional practice, and Catholic orthodoxy, but the test of spiritual and moral experience; in short, the test of present practical value. By this means a form of Church government can be developed which would be progressive and intelligent; provisional in its regulations; experimental in its legislation; sympathetic in its administration. Unless we can secure such a form of Church government, corporate unity may prove more injurious to the influence of the Christian Religion than even the confusions, weaknesses and rivalries of our existing sectarianism.

REVIEWS

BROAD CHURCH THEOLOGY*

If I am to review Dr. Simpson's book, I must be allowed some freedom of pen. I am not well acquainted with his previous works, though I remember looking through one on the Resurrection and feeling that he said, at considerable length, all that he 'ought' to have said in favour of the ordinary ecclesiastical view of the facts, and that anyone sharing that view could refer to the book with grateful satisfaction. The book before me now is much smaller, as befits the relative unimportance of the subject; and I began reading it with interest in the hope of learning what 'Broad Church Theology' is and who were its exponents. There was once, of course, a 'Broad Church School'; but is there now? Dr. Simpson practically destroys his own title on his first page by saying that 'it is not easy to determine with precision what its doctrines are,' and a little later by adding 'the only fair course to take in discussing them is to regard their statements simply as *the opinions of individuals.*' So in accordance with this, 'the only fair course,' he picks out a number of statements, for the most part isolated from their immediate context, and always isolated from the sustained arguments in connexion with which their authors present them, and asks whether those statements or what he conceives to be the Catholic doctrine (which is usually stated by him equally one-sidedly) make the strongest religious appeal. For representatives of the Broad Church School he looks far afield. Here is the list of names: Allen, Matthew Arnold, Bethune-Baker, Adams Brown, Channing, Newton Clarke, Drummond, Glazebrook, Herrmann, Kaftan, Major, Martineau, Milton, Raven, Reville, Ritschl, Schmiedel, Symes. For my own part I can thankfully own a certain sense of kinship, at one point or another, with all these writers. But to regard them, or even the Anglicans among them, as a school with a common theology peculiar to themselves, is absurd. In my innocence I wondered why so much space was given early in the book to fragments of the writings of some of these distinguished Unitarians. I had not thought of Dr. Simpson as a subtle controversialist; and I do not now. He was not cleverly trying to establish, by this list of quotations from avowed Unitarians, a *praejudicium* against the statements of 'Broad' Churchmen, superficially similar, which he had collected. He honestly thinks the theology which they represent is the same as that of Unitarianism; which again, of course, is absurd.

At this point my review might end. No one who treats Dr. Glazebrook, Mr. Major, and Mr. Raven as Unitarian in their theology has any claim on the attention of educated Churchmen. Nor again has anyone who, like Dr. Simpson, ignores the earlier chapters of Mr. Raven's adventurous book *What think ye of Christ?*—chapters which contribute largely to the total picture of our Lord pourtrayed in the book, and concentrates his criticism on one of the later chapters as if it stood alone: for this is not even honest on the part of one who is not mentally deficient.

But Dr. Simpson seems to mean well. His chapters, 'Can we rightly call God personal?' and 'The historic origin of the doctrine of the Trinity' contain much that is useful, and, with parts of other chapters, would, I believe, be endorsed by most of the writers at whom he is tilting. So it

* *Broad Church Theology*, by W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. London: Robert Scott, 1919.

seems worth while to try to point out where and why his book as a whole misses fire.

First and foremost, like the Bishop of Zanzibar, he adopts the extremest form of the *entweder-oder* argument, which he would eagerly disallow when used by German critics of the Gospels. The problem which confronts all real theologians to-day, who start from the traditional Christian position (as, it is well to remind Dr. Simpson and all like him, all the Anglican writers do start), is this: How reconcile the fact that Jesus was to all appearance a man, and was undoubtedly so regarded by all his contemporaries, with the fact that after His death he soon came to be regarded as a Divine being, and that later Christian experience could not be satisfied by any valuation of His significance that made Him less than God—though it ought not to be forgotten that the earlier historical tradition was never entirely ousted from the Catholic doctrine of His person. Orthodoxy insists not only on His full manhood, but also on the subordination, in some respects, of the Son to the Father:—and this, not only, as is sometimes supposed, during His life on earth, but in respect of His manhood; and this manhood was not merely 'assumed' by Him for the space of His experience as man in the world: it was taken up' by Him into heaven, and in the Person of the Son manhood henceforth 'sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty.' For orthodoxy the Trinity, since the Incarnation, is the subject of human experience. [It may be noted in passing that this is a factor in the orthodox doctrine of which considerable use is likely to be made when the apologists of orthodoxy realize that they must come to terms with Modernism.]

Now there are few people with any intellectual training who do not know that the dilemma is the most unintelligent of all forms of argument. Catholic Doctrine always refuses it. And in his constant use of the *either-or* Dr. Simpson is some times simply turning his back on the problem which has to be solved, some times perverting the orthodox doctrine, and some times offending at the same moment in both respects. Here are some of his assertions:—

'The Nicene language *of one substance with the Father* is either truth or fiction.' Well, to no Nicene, and to no really orthodox Christian, would it be the truth about our Lord unless you added to it, 'of one substance with His Mother.' Similarly he says that in the Fourth Gospel and elsewhere Jesus really ranges Himself with the Father on one side, over against the human race on the other side:—'The Son is set with the Father, not with the human race.' This is not even good exegesis of the passages themselves, and it is hopelessly unhistorical and abominably unorthodox. '*Not* with the human race'! *Non tali auxilio.* None of the writers attacked has offended as much the other way. The former sentence is part of an onslaught on Mr. Raven for writing that 'For us, Jesus is God.' Dr. Simpson can only understand such a phrase as meaning that He is 'not truly, really God.' And again, 'If Jesus Christ is for some liberal individuals in modern life (*sic*) no longer God in quite the same sense as He is for orthodoxy, that really means that for them He is not God at all.' In these two passages, typical of many, he begs the whole question. He contents himself with blunt assertions of this kind, and makes no attempt to come to close grips with the real problem, either for the Chalcedonian theology or for modern philosophy. I do not think that he is qualified to do so. He is far too loose in his use of terms. He mixes up, for example, 'personal' and 'essential,' as though

to orthodoxy they were the same. He lectures Mr. Raven for his objection to the category 'substance' while still using 'person,' as though Mr. Raven was not aware that 'person' is a metaphysical term and was not consciously substituting one kind of metaphysics for an other. As for the 'personal identification of God with humanity' in Christ and our Lord's 'personal identity with Deity,' which Dr. Simpson insists on; for strict orthodoxy the first phrase is a little dubious, but both phrases might be used by Modernists who know that our Lord was a man and yet see in Him 'the express image of the personality of God.'

Modernists are well aware of the difficulties inherent in the use of the terms 'person,' 'personal,' and 'personality.' So when I came to Dr. Simpson's chapter on 'Christ's pre-existence,' in spite of my disappointment with the middle chapters, I began it with hope, which rose high when I read at the bottom of a page, 'Finally, we must realize precisely what the doctrine of Christ's pre-existence is.' It flashed through my mind that we ought to have begun by trying to do this:—but let that pass. I turn over the page to find the following passage:—

> 'It does not mean for a moment that the Infant Christ was aware of His Divinity. What it means is this: that having no idea of His pre-existence during His early years He gradually came to realize the fact. What is there inconsistent with human life in this?'

and that is all that Dr. Simpson has to offer us as to 'precisely what' is a doctrine that 'lies at the foundation of our Christian belief,' as to which he insists 'if Christ did not pre-exist, then His personality is simply human.'

There are many statements in the book from which I should dissent, and many others that are obviously true, yet of no value for its main purpose (*e.g.*, of course, 'the mysterious' cannot be eliminated from religion; of course to talk of 'an incarnation of the moral qualities of God' is absurd—I never met with the phrase till I read Dr. Simpson, and of course the traditional orthodoxy is *for those who believe it* a strong support of the traditional Christian ethic). But I hope I have said enough to show 'Modern Churchmen' what the character of the book is, and Dr. Simpson himself that he must acquire much more knowledge of Modernism and of Catholic doctrine before he can come forward effectively as critic of one and champion of the other. But the strength of orthodoxy lies to-day, as some of its ablest professors know, in refusing to 'speak with the (supposed) enemy in the gate.'

J. F. Bethune-Baker.

A CHEERFUL MYSTIC*

'Thou hast conquered, O pale Galilaean!' is the pathetic plaint of Swinburne, re-echoing the dying words of Julian the Apostate. The neo-pagans, who should not complain of their lack of an audience to-day, can never forgive Christianity for what they describe as its asceticism—its negation of life. Nietzsche, as we know, had some hard things to say to this effect; and, as he wrote in a vigorous and lively style, his words told.

It is possible that these writers have had an imperfect understanding of the philosophy of asceticism, and this ignorance some of the ascetics

Centuries of Meditations, by Thomas Traherne. Edited and published by Bertram Dobell. 6*s.* net.

have done little to dispel. Their words and actions have served rather to repel sympathy than to invite understanding. Christian asceticism has suffered, like many another good and worthy thing, at the hands of its friends.

But it forms no part of our intention to discuss the philosophy (or psychology—in these days) of asceticism. It is our object only to draw attention to a writer whose spirit, while essentially and indisputably Christian, in the true sense of the word, is full of that intense *joie de vivre*, which the neo-pagans do not tire of recommending to us as the outcome, exclusively, of their own way of life.

We refer to Thomas Traherne (1636 ?—1674); and his *Centuries of Meditations*—unearthed some twenty years ago by Mr. Bertram Dobell, and published by him, as supplying material for our remarks.

Traherne, as is generally known, belonged to that group of Cambridge Platonists who did so much to spiritualise and rationalise (the two processes are often more nearly parallel than is popularly supposed) English religion in the seventeenth century.

He may be classified—for classifications, however objectionable or absurd, are necessary—as a 'Nature-mystic.' He was, and had been ever since childhood, one of those for whom the world is 'the garment of God.' A passage of extraordinary felicity, couched in that rhythmical prose of which the seventeenth century had the secret, tells us how the world struck the boyish eyes of Traherne.

> 'All appeared new and strange at first, inexpressibly rare and delightful and beautiful. I was a little stranger, which at my entrance into the world was saluted and surrounded with innumerable joys. . . . All things were spotless and pure and glorious: yea, and infinitely mine, and joyful and precious. . . . I was entertained like an Angel with the works of God in their splendour and glory . . .'
>
> 'The corn was orient and immortal wheat which never should be reaped, nor was ever sown—I thought it had stood from everlasting to everlasting. The dust and stones of the streets were as precious gold: the gates were at first the end of the world. The green trees, when I saw them first through one of the gates, transported and ravished me, they were such strange and wonderful things. The men! O what venerable and reverend creatures did the aged seem! And the young men were glittering and sparkling Angels, and maids strange seraphic pieces of life and beauty! Boys and girls tumbling in the street, and playing, were moving jewels. I knew not that they were born or should die. . . . The city seemed to stand in Eden, or to be built in Heaven. The streets were mine, the temple was mine, the people were mine. . . . The skies were mine, and so were the sun and moon and stars; and all the world was mine' (III, 2 and 3).

This is the natural and unaffected expression of an intense religious emotion; and the words perhaps have the same effect upon the mind, as has that sudden and overwhelming outburst of harmony in Purcell's anthem, 'Rejoice in the Lord alway, and again I say rejoice,' which, without affectation, may be said to translate, through the medium of music, some pitch of joy, for which 'there is neither speech nor language,' into terms that we can understand.

No neo-epicurean, with his gospel of self-realisation, could possibly surpass Traherne in zest for life. *Rapturous* is the only adjective that is appropriate to describe him. He is the equal of Whitman here, though

his language, of course, is more restrained—he wrote, we must remember, when the classical tradition was undisputed and indisputable, and before the days of *vers libre*:

> 'You never enjoy the world aright, till the sea itself floweth in your veins, till you are clothed with the heavens, and crowned with the stars: and perceive yourself to be the sole heir of the whole world, and more than so, because men are in it who are sole heirs as well as you. Till you can sing and rejoice and delight in God, as misers do in gold, and kings in sceptres, you never enjoy the world' (I, 29).

An attractive characteristic of Traherne, as it was of Whitman, is his delight, not in abstract Humanity (which is a figment) but in men and women. 'The worse they are,' he charitably and paradoxically observes, 'the more are they to be beloved' (IV, 26), and he speaks, with a notable phrase, of 'communicating yourself like God unto them' (I, 81). His greatest treasures were the sons of men:—

> 'I remember once, the first time I came into a magnificent and noble dining room, and was left there alone, I rejoiced to see the gold and state and carved imagery; but when all was dead, and there was no motion, I was weary of it, and departed dissatisfied. But afterwards, when I saw it full of lords and ladies, and music and dancing, the place which once seemed not to differ from a solitary den, had now entertainment, and nothing of tediousness, but pleasure, in it. By which I perceived (upon a reflection made long after) that men and women are, when well understood, a principal part of our true felicity' (III, 22).

It is this love of his for human beings (and not his theology, which, however, was orthodox enough—though liberal) that lifts Traherne from the category of 'nature-mystic,' into which, perhaps too hastily, we placed him, and makes of him a Christian. His philosophy of life was that it is expanded and enriched by love, and that he who would save his life must lose it in the lives of others. *La multitude des affections élargit le cœur.*

> 'By Loving, a Soul does propagate and beget itself. By Loving it does dilate and magnify itself. By Loving it does enlarge and delight itself. But, above all, by Loving it does attain itself. Souls were made to love, and are dark and vain and comfortless till they do it. Till they love they are desolate, without their objects; and narrow, and little, and dishonourable: but when they shine by Love upon all objects, they are accompanied with them, and are enlightened by them' (II, 48).

And again (a reminiscence of I. John, iv. 20):

> 'Wouldest thou love God alone? God alone cannot be beloved. He must be beloved in all. His nature requireth that thou love all whom He loveth, and receive Him in all those things wherein He giveth Himself unto thee. . . . Thy nature urgeth this: by loving thou expandest and enlargest thyself, and the more thou lovest, art the more glorious. O my Soul, thou livest in all those whom thou lovest' (I, 72, 73).

As for Traherne's intellectual position; he was one of those (as we have indicated) whose object was to humanise theology. He was far

enough removed from the two extremes of puritanic barbarism and sacerdotal rigour. He breathed another air :—

> ' That we are naturally the Sons of God (I speak of primitive and upright nature), that the Son of God is the first beginning of every creature, that we are to be changed from glory to glory into the same Image, that we are spiritual kings, that Christ is the express Image of His Father's person, that by Him all things are made, whether they are visible or invisible, is the highest Philosophy in the world ' (IV, 4).

This is scriptural and humane doctrine, and the first eight words reveal how great a gulf separates our Mystic from the *gendarmes théologiques* of his day, who had drunk deep from the cup of Calvin or Torquemada (as the case might be), and ' like wild bulls ' were full of the fury of the Lord.

Optimists calculate that human beings, if they could make up their minds to conduct their affairs by the light of the knowledge that they are by this time possessed of, might prevent nine-tenths of the misery at present existing in the world. Disease, poverty, crime, war, famine, might be eliminated if the already available knowledge were applied by an enlightened enthusiasm to the end in view. Mr. Bertrand Russell, who, in one of his recent books, makes some such remark, also adds as a corollary that with the disappearance of misery we might hope also to be free of religion and its abuses. With the Millenium might be expected to dawn that non-religion of the future of which Guyau wrote so attractively.

It is indeed possible that certain perversions of the religious spirit might, under these circumstances, disappear for good (and perhaps this is all that Mr. Bertrand Russell desires to prophesy), but there is no reason to hope, or to fear, that religion will progressively tend to evaporate as human beings become gradually more sensible. The contrary result is more probable. And if religion will flourish in Utopia to the extent that Sir Thomas More encouraged his contemporaries to believe, we may say that it will (for all practical purposes) find a theology ready-made—or the elements of such—in the writings of Traherne. *His* religion, at any rate, seems to have no connection with misery :

> ' The end for which you were created, is that, by prizing all that God hath done, you may enjoy yourself and Him in blessedness ' (I, 12)

sums up his philosophy of religion. And again :

> ' God hath made it infinitely easy to enjoy, by making everything ours, and us so easily able to prize them. Everything is ours that serves us in its place. The Sun serves us as much as is possible, and more than we could imagine. The Clouds and Stars minister unto us, the World surrounds us with beauty, the Air refresheth us, the Sea revives the earth and us. The Earth itself is better than gold because it produceth fruits and flowers ' (I, 14).

Of course, Traherne enjoyed certain advantages that we no longer possess. He was not condemned to live—as are the majority to-day—in some stricken area of industrial England, where, except for occasional, and infrequent, sky effects, natural beauty is never seen. It is difficult to be a nature-mystic in the environs of Wolverhampton or of Bradford. But perhaps, with an Utopian régime, beauty will return : and the wilderness will blossom again. Until that day the gloomy doctrines of Calvinism, or of Secularism, seem more appropriate to the inhabitants of those regions which the industrial miasma overshadows.

It has to be admitted also that Traherne must remain for our time (to use the words which Schweitzer has applied to Jesus) 'a stranger and an enigma.' He was of the opinion of Thoreau that freedom with poverty is preferable to the slavery of profitable occupations, and that he who has not two-thirds of his time at his own disposal is a slave.

> 'When I came into the country, and, being seated among silent trees and meads and hills, had all my time in my own hands, I resolved to spend it all, whatever it cost me, in the search of happiness, and to satiate that burning thirst which Nature had enkindled in me from my youth. In which I was so resolute, that I chose rather to live upon ten pounds a year, and to go in leather clothes, and feed upon bread and water, so that I might have all my time clearly to myself, than to keep many thousands per annum in an estate of life where my time would be devoured in care and labour' (III, 46).

Mr. Bertram Dobell, in his Introduction to the *Centuries of Meditations* contrasts Traherne with à Kempis. For the author of the *Imitatio,* Nature and human nature seem somehow to be 'things separate and apart from himself; things not to delight and rejoice in, but to be avoided and shunned.' Whereas, for Traherne they were 'after God Himself, the great fountains of his happiness and the source of his enjoyments.'

And it is indeed probable that the type of religious experience which we see in Traherne, will become progressively more common as the physical conditions of life improve—as we all hope, and intend, shall be the case. And the type which the *Imitatio* represents will tend, gradually no doubt, but surely, to decline. Optimists must believe this. But is not Christianity, it may be asked, essentially and fundamentally a religion of Sorrow? —a religion of redemption from the power of sin and misery? Is not Christ Himself an apotheosis of Suffering Humanity?

It is true that the Cross has this significance, and that a world from which sacrifice, and the pains which attend it, have been banished, has no place for Christianity. Yet we should not forget that for St. Paul, at any rate, religion was a thing of joy, and that his Master was accused of eating and drinking among sinners, to the scandal of gloomy pietists. And, encouraged by that example, the slaves of the catacombs could sing their *Jubilate* with as good a will as their *De Profundis.*

And perhaps in these days, when the younger generation is so full of hope and determination, we do a disservice to religion to assure them that Christianity is primarily a religion of sorrow. Their experiences will, no doubt, lead them to that conclusion in due time. But meanwhile, let Christ be seen in another aspect: not the Man of Sorrows, but One who loved field and sky and hill, the flowers and the birds, and found happiness in the companionship of men and women.

Perhaps this will tend to teach people that there is nothing common or unclean, and that, as Whitman grandly puts it:—

> 'Whoever walks a furlong without sympathy walks to his own funeral drest in his shroud.'

It is this sympathy that is the parent of the joy which is Christian. The self-centred can never experience it, for

> 'Men's lips are closed because their eyes are blinded: their tongues are dumb because their ears are deaf: and there is no life in their mouths, because death is in their hearts' (II, 94).

J. C. Hardwick.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS

West London Branch.—A meeting was held on November 18th, at 4 Sussex Gardens, W., by the invitation of Colonel and Mrs. Clark, when the Rev. A. R. Hedley, Vicar of St. Oswald's, Fulham, gave an interesting address on 'Aspects of Reunion.' On December 8th, a meeting was held at 40 Hamilton Terrace, by the invitation of Mr. and Mrs. Morley Horder. A valuable and delightful paper was read by Archdeacon Lilley on 'Christianity and the World Situation.'

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR, THE ENABLING ACT AND AFTERWARDS.

Canon Glazebrook's clear and temperate account of the situation created by the Enabling Act, with its cautious optimism as to the future, is pleasant reading. But I hoped—and so, I know, did others—that notice would be taken by *The Modern Churchman* of a protest over some distinguished signatures in the *Times* of December 9th against the virtual reimposition of tests, or of a weighty and vigorous letter by the Bishop of Hereford, showing that the provisions of the Schedule to the Act (as was doubtless intended by its authors) exclude Nonconformists from a voice in the National Church, thereby making it sectarian rather than national. The protest, I venture to think, deserved quotation in full; the letter, some analysis and comment.

'Everything,' says Canon Glazebrook, 'will in the long run depend upon the Parochial Councils.' I agree. But if they are to be the foundation of the ecclesiastical edifice, that foundation must be well and truly laid: and I much doubt whether this can be so, under the conditions for claiming the franchise as set forth in the Schedule—especially the negative declaration that the claimant does not belong to any other religious communion. My experience of attempts to start a Parochial Church Council nearly twenty years ago, with much the same conditions as those prescribed by Convocation and recommended by the Bishops, was that the process was unworkable; and I was afterwards allowed to express this opinion in *The Modern Churchman* of January, 1913.[1] Nor am I quite convinced of the wisdom of restricting a seat on the Councils to Communicants. I am rather disposed to agree with the hope expressed by a former Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Stubbs) that 'never again, under any circumstances, would the Holy Communion be made a test.'

At present, it seems to me, the 'Life and Liberty' Movement and the High Anglicans who support it are winning all along the line. I admire the skill and persistency with which they have engineered their operations in Convocation, in Diocesan Conferences or in parish vestries, and lastly in Parliament. But of what sort are the 'life' and 'liberty' which they claim to have secured for the Church of England, time will show for those who live to see the end; which end may not improbably be Disestablishment.

T. L. PAPILLON.

[1] 'The Co-operation of the Laymen,' *Modern Churchman, January*, 1913.

[We had gone to press when the important letters to which Canon Papillon draws attention were published. We have referred to them in this issue, but have not attempted to quote them in full, as we imagine almost all our readers must have read them.—ED., *M.C.*]

MORE 'UNCENSORED CELEBRITIES.'

ALL AND SUNDRY. By E. T. RAYMOND, Author of 'Uncensored Celebrities.' Cloth. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

Brilliant Character Sketches of THE PRINCE OF WALES, M. GEORGES CLEMENCEAU, PRESIDENT WILSON, RUDYARD KIPLING, LORD ROBERT CECIL, JOHN BURNS, HILAIRE BELLOC, MR. SPEAKER, SIR THOMAS BEECHAM, G. K. CHESTERTON, and about 30 other prominent public men.

THE LIFE OF JOHN PAYNE. By THOMAS WRIGHT. With 18 Illustrations. Cloth. 28*s.* net.

Few great authors appeal more to the imagination than John Payne. Recognised as a true poet by Swinburne, he was probably the most skilful translator of the nineteenth century. Among his friends were Swinburne, Dante, Gabriel Rosetti, Arthur O'Shaughnessy, Victor Hugo, and Mallarmé. This is the official biography.

OLD AND NEW MASTERS. By ROBERT LYND. Cloth. 12*s.* 6*d.* net. (Third Impression).

'A book of essays full of charm, insight and sympathy, and of the transmitted enthusiasm that is the basis of all good criticism.'—*Daily News.*

'This is a fascinating volume, and has the right quality of literary criticism.'—*Sunday Times.*

BOLINGBROKE AND WALPOLE. By the Rt. Hon. J. M. ROBERTSON. Cloth. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

'Mr. Robertson is an incisive writer with a definite and individual point of view, and his historical judgments are received with sincere respect even by those who dissent from them.'—*Manchester Guardian.*

'Highly interesting, researchful and valuable.'—*Daily Chronicle.*

THE ARROW OF GOLD. A Novel. By JOSEPH CONRAD, Author of 'Almayer's Folly,' etc. Cloth. 8*s.* net. (Second Impression).

'If I were to be asked in which of Mr. Conrad's writings his genius shows itself at its highest power, I should answer, without hesitation, in this the latest of them.'—SIR SIDNEY COLVIN in the *Observer.*

SHAKESPEARE AND THE WELSH. By F. J. HARRIES. Cloth. 15*s.* net.

SIR SIDNEY LEE writes: 'The topic is most exhaustively treated and the author seems to me to prove beyond question his point that Shakespeare was a very accurate student of Welsh character and tradition. Mr. Harris's research sheds new and convincing light on Shakespeare's myriad-mindedness.'

INSTINCTS OF THE HERD IN PEACE AND WAR. By W. TROTTER. New edition. Revised and Enlarged. Cloth. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

'An exceedingly original essay on individual and social psychology.'—*New Statesman.*

It is a balanced and inspiring study of one of the prime factors of human advance.

THE ROMANTIC ROUSSILLON. In the French Pyrenees. By ISABEL SAVORY. With Illustrations by M. LANDSEER MACKENZIE. Cloth. 25*s.* net.

This book is written for a double purpose; to reveal to lovers of Sculpture the beauties of certain Romanesque work hitherto hidden in remote corners of the Pyrenees, and to suggest to travellers the attractions of a little country formerly known as the Rousillon, which now forms part of the Pyrenees Orientales.

'M.A.B.' (Mainly About Books).—There are still a few copies available of the December (Xmas) issue of 'M.A.B.' Price 3d. post free.
Annual subscription, 1/- post free.

T. FISHER UNWIN, Ltd., Ltd., 1 Adelphi Terr., London, W.C.2.

FROM MR. MURRAY'S LIST.

By the Very Rev. W. R. INGE, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's.

TRUTH AND FALSEHOOD IN RELIGION. **6s. net.**

CONTENTS:—Development of the Religious Conscience—Falsehood in Religion—Religion in the Life of the Individual—Faith and Fact—The Religion of Christ—Problems and Tasks.

'His examination of the Christian essentials, his presentation of Christianity as a natural culmination, his treatment of religion in the individual as a growth subject to well-designed laws, and his discussion on the relation of Christianity to natural science and to civilisation are executed in a scholarly and masterly manner.' —*Glasgow Herald.*

FIRST CHRISTIAN IDEAS. **9s. net.**

By EDWARD CARUS SELWYN, D.D., Hon. Canon of Peterborough Cathedral; sometime Head Master of Uppingham School. Edited with an Introductory Memoir by his Eldest Son. A work of entirely independent research in the data of the first century, the aim being to interpret them afresh as the productions of the order of Christian prophets.

Fresh Light and Comfort from the Holy Scriptures.

THE ETERNAL SAVIOUR-JUDGE. *Third Edition.* **4s. net.**

By the Rev. J. LANGTON CLARKE, D.D. With an Introduction by the Rev. J. R. ILLINGWORTH, D.D. Many have been impressed and strengthened by the profound eschatological truth to be found in this book. On its first appearance 'The Church Times' said that it marked a step forward in eschatology and should be read by all thinking Christians.

SHORTENED AND SIMPLIFIED EDITION. **1s. net.**

JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle Street, LONDON, W.1.

B. H. BLACKWELL Theological and General Bookseller

200,000 volumes, New and Second-hand, always in Stock.

Inspection welcomed.

Rare books found.

Orders by post promptly executed.

Foreign books stocked and procured.

Book-binding undertaken.

50 & 51 Broad Street, Oxford.